

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 27, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the abundant life that Thou hast ministered to us and for all the institutions of this great land that minister to the abundant life. We thank Thee for the presentation of ideals that constantly lure us to the better and the higher life, for the influence of Thy providence that is always stimulating us to endeavor to reach the highest and the best. Grant us to-day the constant ministry of Thy spirit, that we may strive after the things that are pleasing in Thy sight and attain to the end for which Thou hast created us. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. Smoot, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	New	Smith, Md.
Brandeggee	Harris	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Harrison	Overman	Smoot
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Trammell
Colt	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Culberson	King	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	McCormick	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	Moses	Sherman	

Mr. MOSES. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. KEYES] on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] are detained by illness.

I wish to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is absent on public business. He is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. Call the roll of absentees.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SPENCER, and Mr. WOLCOTT answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. SUTHERLAND entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11960) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Georgia calling attention to Point Peter, in that State, an abandoned military reservation, and requesting authority that it may be transferred to the State of Georgia. I ask that it be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

An act to be entitled "An act to memorialize Congress to cede the military reservation known as Point Peter to the State of Georgia, to be used as the site of a State-owned warehouse, and calling the attention of Congress to the value of same for said purpose."

Whereas the United States of America owns 720 acres of high land in the county of Camden, in the State of Georgia, known as Point Peter, which lies adjacent to land owned by the State, and which is only 2 miles from the Atlantic Ocean and near water of a depth of 40 feet and also near the port of St. Marys; and

Whereas with the completion of the proposed St. Marys-St. Marks Canal the said water-front property owned by the State will be of untold value for wharfage purposes, and with the property known as Point Peter could be utilized by the State for the purpose of erecting a State-owned warehouse, which would give the farmers of Georgia adequate warehousing facilities on a direct waterway from New York to all the South American nations; and

Whereas the United States Government is not utilizing the Point Peter land, and has never done so, though it has owned same for more than a hundred years: Therefore be it

Enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, and it is hereby enacted by authority of the same, (1) That the General Assembly of Georgia does request the Congress of the United States of America to cede the Point Peter Military Reservation to the State to be utilized for the purpose of erecting thereon a warehouse for the use of the farmers of the State, at a rate of storage which will be fixed for the purpose of paying operating expenses only.

(2) That the Senators and Representatives of the said State in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to have a bill for the purpose of carrying this resolution into effect introduced in Congress without delay.

(3) That the governor of the State is hereby instructed to forward a copy of this act to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

(4) Be it further enacted that all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

JNO. N. HOLDER,

Speaker of House.

SAM L. OLIVE,

President of Senate.

E. B. MOORE,

Clerk of House.

DEVEREAUX F. MCCLATCHY,

Secretary of Senate.

Approved August 18, 1919.

HUGH M. DORSEY, Governor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of Oscar Bartlett Post, No. 233, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Lamb; of Fairbanks Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Detroit; of E. R. Stiles Post, No. 174, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Hancock; of A. Colvin Post, No. 59, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Michigan, of Gobleville; and of sundry inmates of the Soldiers' Home of Grand Rapids, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., and a memorial of the board of directors of the American State Bank, of Oakwood, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the suspension of the work of widening and deepening the River Rouge, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jackson, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the retirement of superannuated Government employees, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 680, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Cadillac, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the suppression of anarchy and the deportation of undesirable aliens, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Michigan Central System Federation of Railway Shop Employees, of Jackson, Mich., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Cummins-Esch railroad bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Charles A. Learned Post, No. 1, American Legion, of Detroit, Mich., praying that the present hospital located at Fort Wayne, Mich., be turned over immediately for use of the Public Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions of James Shields Post, No. 57, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Wellington; of Dick Yates Post, No. 50, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Eureka; of Antietam Post, No. 60, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Parsons; of Reno Post, No. 83, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Hutchinson; of Mulyane Post, No. 203, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Mulyane; of John Brown Post, No. 44, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Belleville; of Joe Hooker Post, No. 17, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Hutchinson; of Victor Post, No. 293, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Fort Dodge; and of John A. Dix Post, No. 59, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Columbus, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the early passage of the so-called Fuller pension bill, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. From the Committee on Indian Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and I submit a report (No. 395) thereon. I give notice that to-morrow morning after the conclusion of the routine morning business I shall ask the Senate to take up and consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3472) for the relief of the owner of a drill boat known as drill boat No. 3 and a dredge known as dredge No. 9, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 384) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2274) for the relief of the owners of the schooner *Charlotte W. Miller* (Rept. No. 385);

A bill (S. 2452) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the Commercial Pacific Cable Co. (Rept. No. 386);

A bill (S. 3293) for the relief of the owner of the derrick *Capitol* (Rept. No. 387);

A bill (S. 3294) for the relief of the owner of the derrick *Concord* (Rept. No. 388);

A bill (S. 3518) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Urubambra* (Rept. No. 389);

A bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Ellen Agnes Monogue (Rept. No. 390);

A bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of James A. Showen (Rept. No. 391);

A bill (H. R. 1317) for the relief of Robert T. Legge (Rept. No. 392);

A bill (H. R. 1865) for the relief of the Baltimore Dry Docks & Ship Building Co., owner of a dry dock at Baltimore, Md. (Rept. No. 393); and

A bill (H. R. 5346) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co. (Rept. No. 394).

#### ASSISTANT CLERK TO THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. CALDER. I am directed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution 288. The resolution authorizes the Committee on Commerce to employ an additional clerk during the present session of Congress, at an annual salary not exceeding \$1,680 per annum. The committee recommends that the sum of \$1,680 be reduced to \$1,500. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KING. I ask the Senator from New York whether or not, with the clerks which the committee now has, there is a necessity for additional help?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator from Washington can reply as to the necessity.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I delayed presenting this resolution just as long as I could, because I am in hearty sympathy with keeping the number of the employees of the Senate as low as possible; but the Committee on Commerce is now holding meetings with reference to the shipping problem, the river and harbor appropria-

tion bill has come from the House, and the work of the committee is such that the present force is absolutely unable to take care of it.

I did not present the resolution until I was practically forced to do so. I ask for the appointment of this additional clerk only for the present session. I will say to the Senator from Utah that I consulted the Sergeant at Arms several days ago to see if it were not possible for him to detail some of his force to take care of the matter until the expiration of the session, but I found that that could not be done. So, by force of necessity, I presented the resolution.

Mr. KING. I make no objection to the consideration of the resolution in view of the statement of the Senator from Washington.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, in line 2, after the word "rate," to insert "of"; and in line 3 to strike out "\$1,680" and insert "\$1,500," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of \$1,500 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate during the present session of the Sixty-sixth Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3803) for the relief of certain landowners of New Castle County, in the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 3804) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to purchase a tract of land with sufficient water right attached for the use and occupancy of the Temoak Band of homeless Indians located at Ruby Valley, Nev.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3805) to provide and adjust penalties for violation of various navigation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 3806) for the relief of Jonathan D. Long; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 3807) granting an increase of pension to Lilla May Pavy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3808) for the relief of Constance Davies Lathrop; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment proposing to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out at once the provisions of paragraphs A and B of section 7 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanatorium facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines," approved March 3, 1919, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### JAPANESE-AMERICAN RELATIONS.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Record a series of questions and answers on the subject of the American-Japanese relations.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE JAPANESE TIMES,  
New York, N. Y., January 15, 1920.

HON. JAMES DUVAL PHELAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: It is reported by several newspapers to the effect that you are to introduce in American Senate a bill which prohibits children born in this country of Japanese or Chinese parents from becoming citizens of United States of America, and, further, constitutional amendment to prevent Asiatic immigrations.

I will very much appreciate your kindness if you will answer following questions, as it will give us great help in securing a better understanding among our people:



1. Do you or do you not satisfy the recent announcement by Japanese Government that the picture bride be prohibited strictly from February of this year?

2. How far, in your opinion, Californians will continue their anti-Japanese movement?

3. Is Japanese people in California or elsewhere in United States destruct American living standard and their safety than those bolshevik, communist, or some other movement?

4. Do you favor that Japan to keep Shantung or Siberia or elsewhere in Asia in order to settle her immigration problem?

5. Will you state me what would be a best policy for Japan to keep her good relations with America?

6. Do you believe war between Japan and America? If it is possible, will you state your reason?

I will dispatch your answer briefly by cable, and full translation will follow by mail. Your frank advice and an earliest possible reply will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully, yours,

Y. FUWA,

*New York Correspondent to the Taisho Daily News, of Osaka, Japan, Care the Japanese Times, 35 Sixth Avenue, New York City.*

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
January 17, 1920.

Mr. YASUO FUWA,  
*Care the Japanese Times,  
35 Sixth Avenue, New York City.*

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 15, submitting to me six questions to which you politely request an answer.

1. Question. Do you or do you not satisfy the recent announcement by Japanese Government that the picture bride be prohibited strictly from February of this year?

Answer. I am well pleased with the decision of the Japanese Government to refuse passports to "picture brides," but that is not sufficient to meet the objections of California. Other remedies must be found.

2. Question. How far, in your opinion, Californians will continue their anti-Japanese movement?

Answer. California desires very properly to preserve her white population, which is being driven off the soil by the influx of Japanese who have bought or leased land. The law forbids them to purchase land and still they are doing it by taking the land in the name of their children or in the names of corporations, both of which practices are clear evasions of the law. California will, I believe, continue to carry on this movement until the soil is in possession of the white race.

3. Question. Is Japanese people in California or elsewhere in United States destruct American living standards and their safety than those bolshevik, communist, or some other movement?

Answer. There is no comparison between the Japanese and the bolshevik movement. The Japanese dispossess the American people of the land and other means whereby to live, on account of destructive competition, while the Bolsheviki are corrupting their political opinions. The Government has taken action against the criminal Bolsheviki and is deporting them from the country. It would be a solution of California's economic troubles if the Japanese there would return to Japan or concentrate in other countries.

4. Question. Do you favor that Japan to keep Shantung or Siberia or elsewhere in Asia in order to settle her immigration problem?

Answer. I am in favor of giving Japan an outlet in Asia for her surplus population in order to protect my own country.

5. Question. Will you state me what would be a best policy for Japan to keep her good relations with America?

Answer. Japan could best keep her good international relations with America by keeping her people out of America and encouraging those in this country to go to other lands. As long as they are concentrated on the Pacific coast, the Japanese will be a source of irritation. The situation is acute in California, Washington, and Oregon. Australia has been able to protect itself. American public opinion has condemned Japan for her course toward both Korea and China, and good relations could also be improved by changing her policies in these respects.

6. Question. Do you believe war between Japan and America? If it is possible, will you state your reason?

Answer. America will never go to war with Japan or any other country unless under the greatest provocation, and I believe that no such provocation has arisen. All warfare is misunderstanding, and I trust your questions and my answers will serve a good purpose. If the Japanese would put themselves in our place, they would understand the situation. If Americans

spread over Japan, and with improved and patented machinery cultivated the soil, and acquired it in large tracts, displacing the native population, what would Japan do? She would be obliged to stop it to preserve her people. Japanese travelers, students, scholars, and diplomats will always be welcome in America, but not the inexhaustible supply of laborers who can not assimilate with the white race and who destroy the character of the population. Our Government is a Republic and has to preserve the standard of its population in order to exist.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES D. PHELAN.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 11960. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AWARDS OF NAVAL DECORATIONS.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 285, being Order of Business 333 on the calendar.

Mr. PITTMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. PITTMAN. The motion of the Senator from Maine is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable before 2 o'clock. Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Harrison	Nugent	Smoot
Borah	Hitchcock	Overman	Spencer
Brandegee	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Stanley
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Sterling
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Poindexter	Townsend
Cole	Kenyon	Pomerene	Trammell
Culberson	King	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Cummins	Kirby	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	McKellar	Sherman	Williams
Gore	Moses	Simmons	Wolcott
Hale	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Harris	New	Smith, Md.	
	Norris	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 285. On that motion the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has requested the yeas and nays. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of the illness of his wife. I am paired with him during his absence, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MCCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], which I transfer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "yea."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. RANSDELL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] and therefore refrain from voting.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], which I transfer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. I am unable to secure a transfer of that pair, and therefore can not vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY], with whom I am paired, is absent. Under the circumstances I am compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIAL. I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I have been unable to secure a transfer and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] on account of illness.

I wish also to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. GERRY. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] are absent on official business.

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] are detained by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 30, as follows:

#### YEAS—25.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	New	Sutherland
Brandegge	Gronna	Norris	Townsend
Calder	Hale	Page	Wadsworth
Capper	Kellogg	Pointexter	Warren
Coit	Lodge	Smoot	
Cummins	McCormick	Spencer	
Curtis	Moses	Sterling	

#### NAYS—30.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Stanley
Chamberlain	King	Robinson	Trammell
Culberson	Kirby	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	McKellar	Sherman	Walsh, Mont.
Gore	Nugent	Simmons	Williams
Harris	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Harrison	Phelan	Smith, Md.	

#### NOT VOTING—40.

Bankhead	Gay	La Follette	Phipps
Beckham	Harding	Lenroot	Ransdell
Dial	Henderson	McCumber	Reed
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	McLean	Shields
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Swanson
Fall	Kendrick	Nelson	Thomas
Fernald	Kenyon	Newberry	Underwood
Fletcher	Keyes	Owen	Watson
France	Knox	Penrose	Wolcott

So Mr. HALE's motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

#### HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CALDER. I move that the Senate take up for consideration House bill 6863. It is the bill to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia, known as the zoning bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the bill may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill the title of which has just been read.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of build-

ings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this bill has been read through once, and was amended upon motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT]. I ask that the committee amendments be considered at this time.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to hear the bill read. I was not here when it was read before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill has been read.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand; but I did not hear it, and I should like to know its provisions. If some Senator will explain it, that is all right.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I will explain the bill, as the Senator requests.

This bill provides facilities for subdividing the city of Washington into certain zones in which the erection of different characters of buildings may be prohibited. The real purpose of the measure is to safeguard the city from the construction of all sorts of objectionable buildings. About five years ago a law was passed in the city of New York providing a system similar to this. Recently in Baltimore and in St. Louis and in Philadelphia a measure accomplishing the same object has been put into effect. The commission is to consist of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds. Under the bill this commission will determine the different areas in which, for instance, business houses, factories, garages, or apartment houses may be constructed, and may fix the maximum height of buildings. It seems to me, from its operation in other large cities of the country, that it is a meritorious measure.

I shall be glad to answer any questions the Senator from North Carolina may wish to propound.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I simply wanted to know what the provisions of the bill were. I am rather inclined to support the bill. What is the commission to which the Senator refers?

Mr. CALDER. As I have just stated, the bill provides for the appointment of a commission consisting of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds, who will divide the city into certain zones. In some of these zones no business building may be constructed, in some no factories, in others no apartment houses. Of course, these different zones can be changed at any time at the request of 75 per cent of the residents in a given district. As I explained a moment ago, a similar scheme has been adopted in the city of New York, and it has done a wonderful lot of good in preventing the erection of objectionable buildings.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does it affect the height of buildings?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; the height and the area to be covered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think that ought to have been done long ago.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask what will be the status of improvements that are already standing?

Mr. CALDER. The bill does not in any way affect improvements already standing, nor buildings for which permits have been granted.

Mr. WARREN. In a given zone, if factories are already there they remain there?

Mr. CALDER. They will not be disturbed.

Mr. WARREN. And the same with residences, and as to height, and so forth? It corrects none of the evils now existing?

Mr. CALDER. It does not. Of course, you can not take away a man's property and destroy it by law.

Mr. WARREN. Nor does the bill attempt it?

Mr. CALDER. Nor does the bill attempt it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand this bill, there is a feature of it to which I have no objection. That is the feature which regulates the height of buildings. That is a thing to be done in the general interest, and does not and could not sacrifice any proper private interest. But it always struck me that while it was very good policy for a city like Paris—a show city to a large extent—to say to a man, "You shall not build a residence upon a piece of property you have"—maybe the only piece he has, and maybe he can not sell it very well—"but you shall build, if anything, a factory upon it," it is going a little bit outside of what ought to be the right of the public, and is infringing upon private rights, to do the same thing in other cities.

If I understand this bill, there would be a right under it, if I owned a lot in some particular part of Washington and wanted



to build a residence upon it for my family, either to deprive me of the use of the lot, or to force me to build a factory upon it, or to build something else which perhaps I would not have the money to build, or else to sell it.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, that is not quite correct. If the bill should pass, under its terms one would be permitted to build a residence in any part of the city, but it would prohibit objectionable buildings in purely residential sections.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What does the Senator mean by objectionable buildings?

Mr. CALDER. The Senator might own a very nice home in some residential section of this city and a man might come along with a building permit to construct a public garage adjoining it, it being a residential section, and a building of this character would be a good investment. This bill would prevent such a situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have very little sympathy with the idea that my home must be protected from somebody building a garage if he wants to do it. But, leaving that aside, as I understand the bill, if you establish a factory zone you can not have a residence in it.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator is mistaken. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the owner of a lot from constructing a more desirable building than is prohibited in the particular zone.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is distinctly prohibited?

Mr. CALDER. Wherever a similar law has been in effect—and I speak with knowledge, because it has been in effect for five years in New York and has worked splendidly—residences are permitted in any part of the city; but a building like a great laundry or a factory or a garage, or a high office building, is prohibited in the purely residential sections of the city.

My reason for presenting the bill, I will say to the Senator, was to protect the beauty of this city and not permit it to be destroyed by all sorts of objectionable buildings. Suppose some one wanted to build a factory in one of the fine residential sections of the city like Massachusetts Avenue or Sixteenth Street; that certainly would not only be objectionable to the people in the neighborhood but it would destroy the value of the adjoining property, and it is not fair to the people who own homes there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator has instanced Sixteenth Street. I owned for quite a while a residence upon Sixteenth Street. I would have disliked very much, of course, to have seen a garage go up next door. I would have disliked very much to have seen a factory built on the street near me. But that is another matter. If people are to portion out parts of cities to be used for fine residences and get to dictating what sort of houses are to be built, it will finally culminate in their saying to a man of very moderate means that he shall not build a \$3,000 house in the neighborhood where houses cost \$20,000.

I think it threatens to trench very much upon the rights of private property. I do not believe in the system at all. I think if a dorky wants to build a house somewhere, and can not afford to pay over a thousand dollars for it, and happens to own the lot, he ought to be allowed to build it. If somebody wants to build a garage next door to me, and owns the property and I do not, he ought to be allowed to build the garage. If anybody is fool enough to build a factory in a residential part of a city—generally they do not do that, because they want to build close to the railroads or close to the water, one or the other, for shipment purposes—I think he has a right to do it. I very much doubt the right of the public to say to him that he shall not do it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the pending amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment of the committee will be found on page 1, line 8, where, after the words "District of Columbia," it is proposed to insert "the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission."

Mr. CALDER. The committee ask the Senate to disagree to this amendment. When it was inserted in the committee it was not known that the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District was himself a member of the Fine Arts Commission. The amendment would provide for two members of the Fine Arts Commission on the board, and it is thought that one is enough. I ask that the amendment be disagreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The next amendment is on page 2, after line 5, where it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, reading as follows:

There is hereby authorized for the expenses of said commission, including the employment of expert services and all incidental and contingent expenses, the sum of \$5,000, payable one half out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 19, after the word "used," insert a colon and the following words: "Provided, That such regulations may differ in the various districts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 2, line 20, after the word "Provided," strike out the comma and the word "however" and insert the word "further," so that it will read "Provided further."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This completes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of section 2, after the amendment already agreed to, insert the following additional proviso:

And provided further, That the height of the apartment house now in construction, adjoining and immediately in front of Meridian Hill Park, on Florida Avenue, be limited to 67 feet.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, if that amendment is urged, the bill will not get through before 2 o'clock.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the basis of the Senator's objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The amendment affects a building that has been under way for quite a while and upon which a great deal of money has been expended; I think nearly \$2,000,000 of bonds have been issued and sold and are now held by innocent parties, and the amendment proposes to cut the building in two.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, yes; it does. I am pretty familiar with the proposition. It was before the District Committee formerly, and the committee did not report it, but refused to report it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As I understand the matter, the committee reported the proposition favorably.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; it came out, and then it was referred back to the committee, and the committee refused to make a favorable report on the proposition.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was not advised as to that development.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the situation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My only object in offering the amendment was to prevent the destruction of the view from Meridian Hill Park, one of the most superb views in the city. In fact, that is the only park in the city which now has a commanding view of the Capitol and the vistas around for a great distance, and to have such a view obstructed and destroyed by the unsightly top of an apartment house is, it seems to me, to impair most seriously the value of the park to present and coming generations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator should press it as a separate measure and not try to put it on this bill. It will involve the United States in lawsuits and suits for damages, and will involve it in a great deal of cost. It will cost probably several hundred thousand dollars. I hope the Senator will not press the amendment upon this bill. It is all right if he wants to press it as a separate measure, and then, if the Senate sees fit to adopt it, very well.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me add this statement in justification of my action. I am advised that the rough framework of the building is now at the fourth story, and that to limit the height on the part of Congress would simply take off some of the top of the structure, which is not yet permanently built.

Mr. OVERMAN. How many floors are there to be?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The building was to be about 80 or 90 feet high, if I remember accurately.

Mr. OVERMAN. About 8 or 10 stories?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Something like that. I do not recall the exact number.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will ask the Senator if Congress did not appropriate about \$400,000 to buy that park property in order that it might be a place of beauty, and that there might be a great park looking over the city?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly it did, and mainly because it was about the only site left affording such a magnificent view.

Mr. OVERMAN. What authority did these people have for letting a contract to build a 10-story apartment house? Did

they get permission from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SHEPPARD. They did get that permission.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me the officials have been very derelict in their duty.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Immediately afterwards a petition was presented to the commissioners, signed by the engineer commissioner, by the Fine Arts Commission, by the Commissioner of Public Buildings and Grounds, Col. Ridley, asking that the permit be revoked. In view of the attitude of the Senator from Washington, of his statement that the Senate committee passed unfavorably on this measure finally, and of his statement that the pending bill will not be permitted to pass if this amendment is insisted upon, I shall not press it. I want to protest, however, against the destruction of one of the most superb views in this city, the destruction of an artistic value that would have grown with the years. Does the Senator from Washington say that he will oppose the amendment to such an extent that the bill can not pass before 2 o'clock if the amendment is insisted upon?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well. Then I withdraw the amendment. I do not desire to imperil the passage of the bill. I realize that if debate continues until 2 o'clock the bill will fail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word now on the bill that has just been passed. I did not desire to delay its passage, but I wish to say that, in my judgment, the construction of the apartment building will not do what the Senator from Texas fears.

When this matter came up, I went to Meridian Hill Park and to the highest point on it, and took in, as far as my inartistic eye could, the artistic beauties of that place, and how it might be affected by the construction of the building. While it would probably be better not to have the building there, yet it is not going to interfere very much with the outlook. It is not going to affect very seriously the scenic beauty as observed from Meridian Hill Park, in my judgment. The Government of the United States could not afford, for what little interference there might be, to stop the building at this time. It could better afford, after the building is constructed, if it thinks that it should be lowered, to condemn it and pay the damages.

We would enhance the view from Meridian Hill by far by condemning a building across Sixteenth Street to the west of it, which does cut out a very great part of the view from Meridian Hill; but I judge that if Congress were to attempt to do that, those who are opposing the construction of this building would object very strenuously, indeed. The scenic beauty from Meridian Hill Park will not be very seriously damaged by the construction of this building.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Meridian Hill Park is the place where they have been building walls out there on Sixteenth Street?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is Meridian Hill Park.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Should they not tear down those walls? Would not that afford a better view?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not pretend to be an artistic man, but I think that is really an outrage, and we had better take down that wall rather than cut off the top of apartment houses that have been authorized under the law, under a permit in the regular and ordinary way, and which will not, as a matter of fact, affect the view from Meridian Hill.

#### PAY OF ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, ETC.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3383, to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and so forth.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3383) to increase the efficiency of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 4, after the words "Public Health Service," to insert the words "contract surgeons, warrant officers, Army field clerks, and field clerks Quartermaster Corps."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 9, to strike out "50 per cent" and insert "20 per cent" and the following proviso, so as to read:

That the base pay of all officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service, contract surgeons, warrant officers, Army field clerks, and field clerks Quartermaster Corps be, and the same is hereby, increased 10 per cent per annum; and the pay of all enlisted men and of members of the Female Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy is hereby increased 20 per cent: *Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me this is an important bill—

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is.

Mr. SMOOT. It involves the expenditure of a good deal of money. I think it would be well for the Senator from New York, before the amendments are acted upon, to make an explanation of the bill in general, so that at least the few Senators who are now in the Chamber may know something about the legislation, the extent of the increases provided for, what the bill is for, and what it will cost to meet the requirements of the bill if it becomes a law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, at this hour of the day I hesitate very much to suggest the absence of a quorum, and I shall not do so unless the discussion proceeds in such way as to show its necessity. Nevertheless it is unfortunate that for the moment really so few Senators are present, for the bill as drawn and reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate provides for an increase in pay of the officers and enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service, all in one bill.

I might say that in the preparation of the bill I and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs consulted with the chairman and several members of the Committee on Naval Affairs to ascertain whether or not they would have definite objection to the Committee on Military Affairs presuming to legislate on the question of naval pay.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, at a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs this morning this very question came up, but on the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], who could not be present, the meeting adjourned to reconvene later. The Committee on Naval Affairs is interested in the provisions of the bill so far as they affect the Navy.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. I should like to hear from the Committee on Naval Affairs, however, before saying that opposition will be offered to the bill and its passage at this time. I think the Committee on Naval Affairs will offer an amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. As far as I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Page] on many occasions, and with several other members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I understand there will be no objection from him as to the terms of the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from New York will yield at this moment, I think this is of sufficient importance to require the presence of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and others, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum to see if we can not get some Senators here to listen to the discussion that will take place.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	Norris	Spencer
Ball	Harrison	Nugent	Sterling
Borah	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Brandegee	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Townsend
Caldier	Jones, Wash.	Pelan	Trammell
Capper	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	King	Pomeroy	Walsh, Mass.
Colt	Lodge	Robinson	Warren
Cummins	McCormick	Sheppard	Watson
Dial	McKellar	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Frelighuyzen	Moses	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Gerry	Myers	Smith, S. C.	
Gronna	New	Smoot	

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Curtis] is absent on official business.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. La Follette] is absent, owing to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, when the absence of a quorum was suggested I was commencing to explain the terms of the bill. As I said at that time, the bill provides for an increase in the pay of the officers and enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service. The Committee on Military Affairs has been presumptuous enough to attempt the legislation in one bill. As



I said, I and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs have consulted members of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate in order to have their ideas as to the needs of the Navy.

The reason for our presumption in attempting to legislate on the pay of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service all in one bill is just this: All of these services, in greater or less degree, are requesting increases of pay, and to those of us who have looked into the matter it is entirely apparent that great distress exists in all of the services, varying in degree as we regard the grades and the commissioned ranks of the enlisted men and the officers of the several services.

The Committee on Military Affairs feared if the matter of the increase of pay for these different services was dealt with by several different bills emanating from several different committees of the Senate and of the House, that when the legislation was finally completed in that fragmentary form it would inevitably be found that some service would have received a greater increase in pay than some other service. So our hope has been that, whatever shall be done in the matter of increasing pay for these services, the increase shall be exactly the same in all of the services, in order that, after the legislation is finished, neither the Army nor the Navy will have any complaint against its sister services, nor the Coast Guard or the Public Health Service have any complaint against any of the others. I submit that, Mr. President, as a wise legislative policy in the matter of increasing the pay of these services, which, to a greater or less degree, can be classed in the same category, in that they are at all times a part or are potentially a part of the national defense.

Mr. President, it must be well known by all Senators that if we once increase the pay of the Army or the Navy by adding on a certain percentage in cash to the present pay it will never be reduced, for though the cost of living, which has increased so tremendously in the last few years, may, after a period of years, go down, it will be found in the Congress of that time, I apprehend, to be almost impossible to pass a bill reducing the pay of the officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy. I submit that as almost amounting to a legislative axiom.

The Military Affairs Committee has endeavored to find and to insert into a pay bill an element of elasticity in the matter of pay; an element in the matter of pay which will respond to the rising or the lowering of the cost of living as the years proceed in the future; and we have hit upon this scheme, which I desire to explain to the Senate.

It is well known, of course, that the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy receive a ration from the Government free of charge. The Quartermaster General of the Army estimates the cost of that ration, and the appropriations are made each year for the rationing of the Army based upon the estimated cost of the ration for the next ensuing fiscal year. The same is true of the Navy, and the same is true, to a greater or less extent, in the other services, among the enlisted men of the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service.

The cost of the ration varies from year to year. It may interest the Senate to know that the ration used in the Army about six or seven years ago cost the Government about 23 cents; at the time of the Mexican border mobilization it had risen to about 32 cents; and to-day it stands at 55 cents. In other words, the Government has been compelled to pay more and more money for the food which it issues to the soldiers, as a result of the increase in the cost of living, and it will be found by examining statistics and tables that the cost of the ration to the Government has very closely followed the rise in the general cost of living to the public; in other words, the cost of the ration in the last four or five years has approximately doubled, and it is fair to say that if the cost of living in the years to come goes down the cost of the ration to the Government will go down. So the committee has provided in this bill that, so far as the commissioned officers of the Army and the Navy and the other services are concerned, the bulk of their increased pay shall not be given them in cash in the first instance, but shall be given to them in the form of a commuted ration, and the several grades of the commissioned strength of the Army and the Navy are to get their proportionate increase in pay, under the terms of the bill, by means of the payment to them of commuted rations in proportion to their rank.

The machinery which we have devised to bring that about is very simple and is just this: Every officer in the Army and every officer in the Navy is entitled to so many rooms as quarters. For example, a second lieutenant in the Army is entitled to two rooms, which he receives in kind or else the

rent value of those rooms, fixed at \$12 a room, is commuted and paid to him in cash. A first lieutenant in the Army is entitled to three rooms; a captain in the Army is entitled to four rooms; a major in the Army is entitled to five rooms; a lieutenant colonel in the Army is entitled to six rooms; a colonel is entitled to seven rooms; and so up the scale through the ranks of brigadier general, major general, lieutenant general, and general. The same thing is true in the Navy, that wherever rooms are necessary for the housing of a naval officer on shore, where he can not get his quarters in kind, he also is entitled to rooms. An ensign in the Navy is entitled to two rooms, just as is a second lieutenant in the Army; a junior lieutenant in the Navy is entitled to three rooms, just as is a first lieutenant in the Army; and so on up the grades of naval rank, by exactly the same degree of progression, are naval officers entitled to quarters.

The bill provides that the officers of the Army and the Navy shall receive one ration per day for each room they are entitled to under quarters; in other words, the second lieutenant in the Army will receive his base pay, and, under the terms of the bill, that base pay will be increased only 10 per cent in cash, as an original cash payment; but as he is entitled to two rooms under quarters, he will receive the value of two rations per day; and, as the ration is now worth 55 cents, a second lieutenant will get \$1.10 a day added pay. The first lieutenant will get the value of three rations per day, the captain will get the value of four rations per day, the major will get the value of five rations per day, the lieutenant colonel will get the value of six rations per day, and the colonel will get the value of seven rations per day added pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is hardly a net increase, because the old ration cost something.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Mississippi interrupts me to say that it is not a net addition, because the old ration used to cost something, but under existing law the officers of the Army and the Navy do not receive any rations at all. I have no doubt that Senators understand that perfectly well, but a large portion of the public fails to realize that the officers of the Army and Navy have to feed and clothe themselves, whereas the enlisted men are fed and clothed by the Government.

It will be seen, Mr. President, that by injecting this element of increase of pay, brought about by the payment of a commuted ration, we have put in the legislation an elastic element, which in the future, as the years go by, will respond, up or down, to the cost of living.

In other words, the bill provides that for the first ensuing fiscal year after the passage of the act the value of the ration shall be regarded as 55 cents, and that annually thereafter the value of the ration shall be restated and reestablished in conformity with the actual cost of the ration to the Government; so that if the cost of living goes down, we will say, two years from now, and it only costs the Government 45 cents per ration, the pay of the second lieutenant, who is drawing commuted rations at the rate of two a day, will go down proportionately; if the cost of living goes up two years hence, and it is necessary for the Government to pay 60 cents for a ration, the pay of the officer will go up just that amount; in other words, this whole scheme of pay for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service is put upon such a basis as not only are the officers protected in the matter of their ability to live within their pay, but also the Government and the taxpayers are protected, so that the Government will get the benefit which should accrue to the Government in the event that the cost of living goes down in the years to come.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Perhaps I ought not to ask the question, but I know very little about military affairs. The Senator has made the bill very clear, even to me, as to pay of the commissioned officers; but what happens to the noncommissioned officers and enlisted men who happen to be married?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was going to cover that.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, I fully understand that a noncommissioned officer or an enlisted man gets his board from the Government; but in the case, we will say, of sergeants—and there are a great many of them who have served for 30 years; I know several of them—they get a base pay of \$38 or \$44, the highest that any of them gets, I believe, being \$60 per month. Now, what happens to them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was about to explain to the Senate what the bill proposes to do for the noncommissioned officers and the enlisted men.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the matter of the officers I wish he would be kind enough to explain to me section 2, which begins:

Sec. 2. That the provisions of the act of May 11, 1908, the act of May 13, 1908, the act of May 12, 1902, and the act of August 14, 1912, as respectively specifically limit to \$5,000, \$4,500, and \$4,000 the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major in the Army and Marine Corps—

Then comes—

and captain, commander, and lieutenant commander in the Navy; and captain commandant, senior captain, and captain in the Coast Guard; and assistant surgeon general, senior surgeon, and surgeon in the Public Health Service are hereby repealed.

Does that apply to all of the acts mentioned?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; it applies to all those acts. I can explain what that means.

Mr. LODGE. Down to the words "Marine Corps," in line 7, it reads like a preamble, and I had supposed substantive provision began at line 8.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; it reads:

Sec. 2. That the provisions of the act of May 11, 1908, the act of May 13, 1908, the act of May 12, 1902, and the act of August 14, 1912, as respectively specifically limit to \$5,000, \$4,500, and \$4,000 the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major in the Army and Marine Corps; and captain, commander, and lieutenant commander in the Navy; and captain commandant, senior captain, and captain in the Coast Guard; and assistant surgeon general, senior surgeon, and surgeon in the Public Health Service are hereby repealed.

Mr. LODGE. The words "as respectively specifically limit" seem to me to constitute a somewhat awkward phrase.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It expresses, however, exactly what is desired to be done. I do not object to changing the wording so long as the meaning is not changed.

Mr. LODGE. Why is the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and other officers mentioned there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The acts which are recited in the first four lines of section 2 of the bill are a series of enactments which limit the progressive increase of the pay of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service to a certain figure. The Senator will remember, for example, that in the Army officers receive a 10 per cent increase in pay for each five years of service.

Mr. WARREN. Up to 40 per cent, not including the limits which the Senator—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Up to but not exceeding an aggregate increase of 40 per cent; but in no event, under existing law, must the pay of a colonel go above \$5,000, the pay of a lieutenant colonel above \$4,500, or the pay of a major above \$4,000. The same law applies to the corresponding grades in the Navy. In other words, the "foggy," or 10 per cent increase which accrues every so often in the pay of an officer in the Army or the Navy after so many years of service under existing law, must stop at these figures in those three respective grades. This bill repeals those provisions of law and permits the officer to continue to receive the increase, ordinarily called, as I remember, the "foggy."

Mr. WARREN. But the 40 per cent maximum remains?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The 40 per cent maximum still remains.

Mr. LODGE. I understand what the first clause means. Now, what happens to the lower grades—captain, commander, and lieutenant commander of the Navy; captain commandant, senior captain, and captain of the Coast Guard; assistant surgeon general, senior surgeon, and surgeon of the Public Health Service, and so on?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The captain in the Navy is one of the officers who are now limited to the figure fixed in the law—\$5,000. The commander in the Navy is limited to \$4,500, and the lieutenant commander in the Navy is limited to \$4,000. We repeal that limitation for the Navy, just as we do for the corresponding ranks in the Army.

Mr. LODGE. I understand what the Senator says it means.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what it does mean.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to criticize the language, but I think it is one of the blindest sections I ever saw. I am only trying to find out the facts. I am thoroughly in favor of the bill. I am interested in the Coast Guard, however, because they were not legislated for or placed in the Navy until the war came on, and none of the acts dealt with here affected them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but, Mr. President, I think the Senator forgets that the war-time legislation gives the Coast Guard officers assimilated rank with the Navy. The Senate has passed a joint resolution continuing that in time of peace. Therefore, they should be included here with their corresponding officers in the Navy, as well as the Navy officers included with their corresponding officers in the Army.

Mr. LODGE. They were put in in that way, and a joint resolution, I know, passed continuing it. Now, what is it that is repealed in their case?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no specific law on the statute books which prevents a captain commandant of the Coast Guard receiving a salary of more than \$5,000; but now that he has been given assimilated rank, pay, and allowances with a naval officer, you do not want that naval statute to apply against him.

Mr. LODGE. I see. None of the statutes that the bill repeals do apply against him?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They do apply against him, now that he has become a potential part of the Navy. He is brought under the pay and allowances provisions of the Navy by the action of the Senate just the other day. Therefore, we must protect him as well as we do the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. I see. Now, where does it leave him? Does it affect his rank?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. It leaves the rank that was granted him under the war provisions of the Navy?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Exactly so.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, that joint resolution has only passed the Senate. It has not passed the House; and, if I remember correctly, I think the resolution does not touch any of the district superintendents of the Coast Guard.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. GERRY. So that, as I understand, under the act of 1915, when the Coast Guard was created, no provision was made for the rank of the superintendents.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. GERRY. Then the Coast Guard went under the Navy under the act of 1918, in which case they received rank and pay as naval officers. Now I understand that they have gone back to the Treasury Department, and that as soon as peace is declared they will lose the rank that they held under the Navy. In any event the joint resolution that was passed by the Senate does not cover the superintendents.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. GERRY. So that those men will really be in worse position than the keepers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is true. This bill, however, does not bring that about. That is due to other things.

Mr. GERRY. Therefore, I will say to the Senator, I shall at the proper time suggest an amendment to cover that situation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would it disturb the Senator from New York if, as a matter of information to the Chair, the Chair could ascertain what the 40 per cent increase would bring this pay up to?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The 40 per cent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The Chair understands that with this repeal they are permitted to increase the pay 40 per cent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think I can give that information, Mr. President, in a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Also, the time that a man has to serve to get the 40 per cent. The Chair ought to know that, but he does not.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For example, Mr. President, a major in the Army to-day receives a base pay of \$3,000. If he has had 20 years of service in the Army, however, his foggies bring the total amount up to \$4,000. Under this bill he will get \$4,620 as annual pay, and his commutation of rations adds another \$1,003.75; so that his total pay, exclusive of the \$12 a room for quarters allowance when it can not be furnished in kind, and exclusive of heat and light when it can not be furnished in kind, will be \$5,623 after 20 years of service.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, can the Senator say what those additional items would amount to?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Those additional items are as follows: For annual commutation of quarters, he gets a total of \$720 to pay his room rent for a year—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And then rations?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The rations become a part of the pay under the terms of this bill, and that is the large body of the increase—the ration commutation, amounting to \$1,003 in increase in pay.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The rations are included in the 10 per cent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no. The officers of the Army and Navy under this bill receive a 10 per cent increase in pay, plus the payment of the commuted ration, as I have explained.

The Senator from North Dakota asked me about the enlisted men. Very much the same problem is found among the enlisted



men, but it is found to a very large degree among the noncommissioned officers.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator has not quite made it clear whether the \$5,620.75 includes the item for rations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then to that should be added \$720 for rooms?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the officer, a major, is living away from an Army post.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; I am taking such a case.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; then he would be given \$720 a year to pay his room rent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What besides that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The heat and light, which I have read, I think.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What would that amount to?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Two hundred and fifty-nine dollars and two cents to pay for his heat and his light for a year. Those are the present allowances. The heat and light allowance and the quarters allowance are the present ones, and we do not disturb them at all. He would receive the total which I gave in cash after 20 years of service, and had reached the rank of major.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What would that total come to, then, including rooms and heat and light and increase in pay?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The whole thing would be \$6,602.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As against what total now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Four thousand nine hundred and seventy-nine dollars.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is nearly a 50 per cent increase.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President; it is a 31 per cent increase. That has all been figured out, Mr. President. Let me say, for the information of the Senate, that the 10 per cent increase given to officers under this bill, plus the payment of the commuted ration, amounts to a fraction underneath 31 per cent net increase in pay.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota asked me about the enlisted men, and I should like to proceed in an attempt to say what the bill does for them.

As I said a moment ago, the same condition is found among the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy, but it is found mostly among the noncommissioned officers. I do not need to tell the Senate that the noncommissioned officers in the Army, and the corresponding grades of the enlisted personnel of the Navy—I think they are called the petty officers, and have other designations—are the backbone of the services. Your Army is no good at all unless its sergeants are good men. You may have the best officers on earth, but if your noncommissioned officers, who are the natural and proper "go-betweens" between the officers and the enlisted men, are not first-class men, you have neither morale nor efficiency. Therefore it is to the interest of the Government so to treat the noncommissioned officers that they will reenlist after each term of enlistment expires, that they will make a life career of the Army; and the same is true of the Navy. They are the ones who exert the influence upon the young private soldiers and the young apprentice seamen. Without their influence, without their power, without their steady effect in the matter of morale and discipline, you have nothing.

Now, you can not expect men to go into the Army and rise up through the grades of corporal, sergeant, first sergeant, quartermaster sergeant, and other noncommissioned grades and pay them at such a low rate that they can not afford to marry. You can not ask a man to live that kind of a life. It turns out that the pay of the noncommissioned officers of the Army—and the same is true about the Navy—is so low to-day, as compared with the cost of living, that they can not support their families. Furthermore, they can not get out of the Army in very many instances; they have been in it so long that it has become their life work. It would be mighty difficult for them to go out into civil life, after 20 or 25 years' service in the Army, and start all over again to make a living and support a wife and three or four children. Nevertheless, that wife and those three or four children must be supported by the noncommissioned officer while he is in the Army, because the Government gives nothing to the support of a noncommissioned officer's family.

The noncommissioned officer himself is fed and clothed by the Government. But his wife is not fed and his children are not fed, nor is his wife clothed or the children clothed or the children educated by the Government. He must still support his family very much as a civilian does, except that he does not have to pay for what he actually eats or what he actually wears.

The noncommissioned officers of the Army in the upper grades are entitled to quarters under certain regulations wherever quarters are available. For example, the quartermaster sergeant stationed over here at Fort Myer, if there are quarters suitable for a noncommissioned officer and his wife at that post, is entitled to them, and he is entitled to so many rooms under the regulations of the Army.

This bill gives him a commuted ration for each room that he is entitled to under the regulations and raises his pay 20 per cent besides.

Mr. GRONNA. How much would that amount to?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It amounts to different sums in different grades, and I will give the Senator the figures. This, to my mind, is just as important as the provision for officers; and yet I will say to Senators that the distress now being experienced not only among the noncommissioned officers and their families but among the commissioned officers is very great, indeed. I have been told on the most reliable authority that there are wives of Army officers who to-day are selling their household linen and ornaments out of their houses in order to try to get together enough money to make both ends meet. Two thousand two hundred officers, one-fifth of all the officers, have resigned from the Regular Army in the last six months. The poor noncommissioned officer can not resign. He would if he could. He is enlisted for a term of years, and he must serve out his enlistment unless the Government, for some reason or other, is willing to let him go; and the Government can not let him go. It has to have his services.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me ask the Senator a question. These noncommissioned officers are given an increase of 20 per cent under the bill, and then they are given the rations. If you calculate a ration upon a percentage basis, what would it amount to for a first sergeant, let us say?

Mr. WADSWORTH. A noncommissioned officer, Mr. President, who is entitled to quarters under present regulations will, of course, get a ration for each room of his quarters plus 20 per cent of his present pay. The payment of rations at the present value of 55 cents per ration amounts to a fraction over 20 per cent actual increase in pay.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, at the present cost of living and at the present price of rations, he would get a real increase of 40 per cent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, in the cases where they are entitled to rooms; and he gets, in any event, an increase of 20 per cent. The Senator has asked me how it would work out.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator begins on that, because I do not want to interrupt him in it, I wish to call his attention to a matter which I think ought to be corrected by a proviso in section 2. When the Coast Guard was amalgamated with the Navy for war purposes, under the act of 1918, at that time very properly under the naval bill they made provision for the district superintendents and the senior superintendents, and assimilated them in rank, so that they had naval rank, and they have it now. But under that provision of the appropriation act it was to terminate at the conclusion of peace, and those men, who are the finest officers in the Coast Guard Service, will lose thereby their assimilation; they will be thrown out practically altogether. They will not get the pay of a keeper of a life-saving station.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. They ought to be covered. A very simple amendment will do it. There are only 14 of them altogether. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] has an amendment which covers it. It is very simple.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will present it after the committee completes its statement on the bill?

Mr. GERRY. That is my purpose.

Mr. LODGE. I shall have to leave the Senate in a moment, and I thought the Senator would forgive me for calling his attention to it now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, Mr. President, we will take the case of a first sergeant. His present pay is \$51 a month. He will get a 20 per cent increase of that, which will make his pay \$61.20. If there are quarters available at the post at which he is stationed, his family can occupy those quarters, and he saves room rent. That is the case to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Suppose there are no quarters available. Then what happens?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Government under present law does not pay room rent for the families of noncommissioned officers.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Is there any reason why he should not have compensation equal to the cost of the room rent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It might be arranged by a regulation.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If a room could not be found, it seems to me he ought to be entitled to compensation equal to the cost of a room.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Government, of course, would have to put on a flat rate per room.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It applies to commissioned officers, and it seems to me that if a noncommissioned officer is entitled to rooms, if they can be had, he ought to be entitled to the cost of the rooms when they can not be had.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. Take the case of a master electrician. His present pay is \$81 a month. He will get \$97.20 per month as the result of this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Would the Senator object to an amendment providing that in cases where noncommissioned officers can not occupy quarters, an allowance shall be made? I agree with the Senator in his statement of a moment ago, that the noncommissioned officers are really the important part of the Army, so far as its morale is concerned, and why should not a noncommissioned officer have the same opportunity to get an allowance for quarters as a commissioned officer?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I would have no objection at all, provided it were confined to the upper grades of the noncommissioned officers. I think when a man has reached the upper grades, it ordinarily means he has had 12 to 15 or 20 years' service. I think it is good policy on the part of the Government, and money well spent, to make that man's life and his family's life a comfortable one, rather. It will never be too easy for him.

Mr. GRONNA. I suggest to the Senator that he prepare an amendment which will provide for that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will say frankly to the Senator that this bill did not attempt to change any existing law as to those who should have quarters and who should not. It merely took existing law as we found it in that respect and built upon it to get our increases.

Mr. GRONNA. But we do change existing law so far as it will apply to commissioned officers. We repeal two or three statutes, and I can see no good reason why we should not undertake to provide for these men, who have been faithful in their service for 15 or 20 years, and some of them for nearly 30. I know some of these men who have been in the service since the Spanish-American War, and who are in the service at this time. Of course, they were promoted for a short time, but they will have to go back. Some of those who are now lieutenants will have to go back to the rank of sergeant. They will get in the neighborhood of \$60 a month. How are they to live on \$60 a month? It seems to me it would be impossible.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have already stated that to be the fact.

Mr. GRONNA. As I understand it, the Senator will have no objection to an amendment to provide for quarters for these men or making an allowance when there are no quarters?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection at all, Mr. President, to the principle involved in that suggestion. But I warn the Senator it must be very carefully drawn; we will have to give a great deal of consideration to it. But I think it is applicable to a bill of this sort; I do not mean to discourage the Senator, but we have to work out what grades it shall apply to.

Mr. GRONNA. I am perfectly willing to leave that to the chairman of the committee, because he knows a great deal more about it than I do.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not sure I do. My mind, Mr. President, has been puzzling about these things. I am not sure I know which is right and which is wrong.

Again speaking of the enlisted man, if you will examine the bill you will find that the bill does not bring any increase of pay to the privates in the Army or the apprenticed seamen in the Navy. Their pay was increased 100 per cent only two and a half years ago. The private in the Army gets \$30 a month the instant he enlists. He is almost invariably a bachelor. Of course, almost invariably he is a young man. The Government feeds him, clothes him, gives him medical care, transports him when he is on duty, pays practically all his expenses, except what might be termed pocket expenses for tobacco and for entertainment. He gets \$30 a month as it is.

It may be said that \$30 a month is too low to attract men into the Army. The answer to that is that you will never be able to make it high enough to compete with private employ-

ment, anyway. The only thing that will attract men into the Army in time of peace is the prospect for advancement and better pay after a comparatively short period of efficient and faithful service. In other words, a young man would be willing to go into the Army at the base pay of \$30 if he felt sure that after a year or two or three years of faithful, efficient service he could become a private, first class, and get an increase, as this bill would provide, of \$9 per month in his pay. And if he made good there he would become a corporal and get another increase. If he made good there, he would become a sergeant and get another increase. So that after 6, 8, or 10 years' service in the Army he would really be on an excellent basis. It is the inducement held before them by a properly balanced pay schedule of that kind which will recruit your Army. You never can go out into the market and outbid industrial wages to-day in getting men in the Army in the first instance. If you attempt it you will bankrupt the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the Senator's argument is most excellent; but it only goes to show that the more you remunerate the noncommissioned officers the more attractive it makes the service to the enlisted man. Therefore I think it shows the importance of taking care of the noncommissioned officer as soon as possible and giving him something to look forward to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I will just show what this bill does in that respect.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is not that he shall be a commissioned officer, but he has something to look forward to as a noncommissioned officer.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. The Senator speaks of the inducement in getting the private soldier in, that he has a chance to be promoted and become a corporal. As compared with the number of privates in the Army, there are, of course, only a small number of corporals. They can not all be corporals. Is that really much of an inducement when it must be confined to so few?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are more than the Senator supposes.

Mr. NORRIS. I have known of regiments where they had only one private and all the rest were officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is speaking about Central America. The privates of the Army comprise about 49 per cent of the enlisted strength; the first-class privates, about 24 per cent of the enlisted strength; and the other 26 per cent, approximately, of the Army is made up of corporals, sergeants, and the higher grades in the noncommissioned ranks. This bill leaves the pay of the private at \$30, just where it is to-day. The pay of a first-class private, instead of being \$33, as it is to-day, is made \$39.60, quite a big increase. The pay of a corporal, instead of being left at \$36, as it is to-day, is made \$43.20. Fourteen per cent of the Army are corporals.

Mr. NORRIS. How does the private become a first-class private?

Mr. WADSWORTH. By good service.

Mr. NORRIS. Is that open to all privates?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Absolutely.

Mr. NORRIS. So that if they all performed good service we would have an Army composed entirely of that class?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the law limits to about 25 per cent the number of the men who can be made first-class privates.

A sergeant, instead of getting \$38 as he gets to-day, would get \$45.60—that is, the line sergeant. The staff sergeant would be raised from \$44 to \$52.80. Then when we get above the line and staff sergeants we begin to get into the noncommissioned class, where men have had quite extensive service and are apt to be married, and there the same increase in proportion extends. These are the ones whom the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] thinks might well be given quarters as a matter of right wherever they are stationed. They are now given quarters only when the quarters are available at the Army post.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator what proportion of Army posts will have such available quarters?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I could not answer that accurately. Before we went into the war with Germany a good many Army posts did have them, because the Army was largely stationed at old Army posts, such as Fort Myer, for example, but since the war the Army has been moved into these big cantonments and is largely stationed at the big cantonments, which consist, as the Senator knows, almost entirely of barracks for the men alone, and there are no officers' quarters or noncommissioned officers' quarters worthy of the name at these cantonments. If it is intended to build them, it can be done, but we must remember all the time that we are spending the people's money.

Mr. President, the bill as drawn will increase the maintenance cost of the Army to the extent of \$28,738,000 per year, of the



Navy \$26,685,000 per year, the Marine Corps \$2,637,000 per year, the Coast Guard \$806,000 per year, and of the Public Health Service \$642,000 per year. I have left off the hundreds and fractions of hundreds.

The total increase which the bill would carry and impose upon the Treasury for the horizontal raising of the pay of officers and enlisted men of all five services would be \$59,530,000. I know full well that is somewhat discouraging. It means another increase in appropriations. I do not like it, and I assume that no other Senator likes the prospect of spending approximately \$60,000,000 more. But the alternative is a very serious one. If we do not spend that amount of money, or approximately that amount of money, or unless there is a most marked change in the conditions of life within one or two years, we will not have any army and we will not have any navy. When these noncommissioned officers' terms of enlistment expire, they will not reenlist. They can not reenlist at the present rate of pay. The commissioned officers of the Army are getting out of it just as fast as they can.

Mr. WILLIAMS. How many have gotten out?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Twenty-two hundred have resigned from the Regular Army during the last six months.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator know how many naval officers have resigned?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know, but I know a large number of them want to resign. Their families are in distress; they can not educate and clothe their children decently. It is no fault of theirs, and, as a matter of fact, it is no fault of the Government in the first instance. It is the fault of the famous "H. C. L."—high cost of living.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. In just a moment. Let us remember that in the case of the Army, for example, the pay of the officers has not been increased one iota since 1908. The cost of living has a little more than doubled in that interval.

The pay of the enlisted men of the Army was very largely increased shortly after the outbreak of the war, so the bill does not provide as large an increase in pay for the enlisted men clear through all the grades of enlisted men as it does for the officers; but if you take the increase given to the enlisted men in May, 1917, and add to it the increase provided for in this bill you will find that since 1908 the enlisted men will have been increased by a much larger percentage than the officers will have been increased as a result of this bill alone.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. Does the Senator know how the resignations of officers from the Army are distributed as to rank, or has the Senator data showing that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have it in my office and will get it here in just a moment; but I will say that they have occurred in every rank from colonel down. Of course, the greater number are in the grades of captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant. I will tell the Senate why. These men have not been in the Army too long; they can get out and take their chance in civil life in making their living; but when a man has been in the Army 20 or 25 or 30 years and has reached the upper grades and has a family of half-grown or almost fully grown children he takes a terrible chance when he leaves the Army, and he feels that he has to stay on until he reaches the age of 64 and can be retired on three-quarters pay. So the majority of the resignations occur in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain. Those are the young men, and, incidentally, those young men who are resigning from the Army to-day in the lower commissioned grades are the most valuable men if they could be kept in the Army. They are men with initiative, with gumption, with enterprise, who are not afraid to leave the Army and go out and make their own living. We are losing the best. The tendency is for the lethargic young man, the slow-minded, slow-thinking young man, the young man without much enterprise, to stay in the Army.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The timid one, too.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. I have not had an opportunity to hear the entire argument of the chairman of the committee. Perhaps I am asking him to repeat, but I am anxious to know if he has any data connected with the raise to show the relation of the increase of salary to the increase in the cost of living since the last appropriation fixing the existing rate some 10 years ago.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can tell the Senator in a word. The pay of officers of the Army was fixed last in 1908. They have had no increase since of any kind whatsoever. The pending bill gives them a net increase of a fraction under 31 per cent.

The cost of living has gone up more than 100 per cent. The bill does not bring them up to the increased cost of living. It only goes one-third of the way.

The enlisted men, particularly the privates, in 1917 were increased 100 per cent. The base pay of the private was raised from \$15 a month to \$30 a month. The base pay of other grades of enlisted men was increased but not quite in the same ratio, but the private got 100 per cent in 1917. This bill does not raise the pay of the private, but it raises the pay of all the other enlisted men, up through the noncommissioned grades, 20 per cent.

The Senator from South Dakota asked me about resignations.

Mr. STERLING. Yes. Has the Senator the data now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have it. Four lieutenant colonels resigned, 25 majors, 199 captains, 816 second lieutenants, and 1,106 first lieutenants. These resignations are distributed as follows: Eight hundred and thirty-five officers have resigned from the Infantry, 409 from the Coast Artillery, 344 from the Cavalry, 284 from the Field Artillery, 149 from the Medical Corps—and that is a very serious loss, which actually threatened the proper care of the sick in our hospitals—96 from the Engineers, 33 from the chaplains, 25 from the Dental Corps, 19 from the Veterinary Corps, 10 officers from the Philippine Scouts, 4 from the Quartermaster Corps, and 2 from the Judge Advocate General's Department. That is one-fifth of all the officers in the Army.

Mr. STERLING. I understood the Senator to say that the officers' increase amounted to 31 per cent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Counting the commuted rations.

Mr. STERLING. That is what I wanted to understand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill gives officers a 10 per cent flat increase in pay plus the payment of a ration per day for each room they are entitled to under quarters, and that means a uniform increase of 31 per cent clear up the line. That applies to the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service. They are all treated exactly alike.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERNALD in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. STANLEY. When I was in the House four or five years ago my attention was called to the fact that at that time there was practically a standing offer from various fields of engineering, steel plants, and the like, for capable young officers of the Army at very much larger pay than the Government provided. Does that condition still exist?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; more so than ever. A bright young officer who has had the education which the Government has given him can get twice as much pay on the outside as he can in the Army. He likes to stay in the Army because he likes the Army life. That is the only thing that keeps him.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. CALDER. Can my colleague inform me what is the pay received to-day by a second lieutenant in the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; I can give my colleague the figures exactly. A second lieutenant gets \$1,700 a year base pay. If he can not get quarters in kind and has to rent rooms at the place where he is ordered to serve, he will get \$288 allowed to him to pay his room rent for a whole year, which would not pay it for four months here in Washington.

Mr. CALDER. I thought I might contrast that with the fact that I am employing to-day in New York several alien laborers who can not speak the English language, and I am paying them \$7 a day, which for 300 days in the year would make \$2,100 a year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Our hearings disclosed the fact that bricklayers in Washington receive \$9 a day wages—

Mr. CALDER. Ten dollars a day now.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We are all glad they get that amount, but a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps operating in the operating room of Walter Reed Hospital every day, with the lives of men dependent upon his skill, only gets \$6.50 a day. How can they stay in the service? The young man who testified to that effect told us he had put in his resignation four times. They can not let him go because he must continue to operate at the Walter Reed Hospital. In the last fiscal year that man has run into debt \$1,200 living here in the city of Washington with his wife. They have no children. They live in two rooms. They cook their breakfast in one room and eat it in the other—in the bedroom. They never can invite anybody to come to see them, and by the same token they can not accept

invitations for entertainment elsewhere. They are crowded out of all entertainment and all the joys of social life. That was a specific instance given to us. As soon as that man can do so, he is going to leave the Army. He is running into debt at the rate of \$1,200 a year, and he was brave enough and frank enough to submit to us his expenses and those of his wife, item by item and day by day, to show just how they struggled to keep within his salary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would he not be not only a fool, but dishonest, if he did not leave the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, he must leave the Army.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He would be dishonest if he did not do so.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He owes something like \$2,000 for his medical education, which has not yet been paid for.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I may have been absent when the subject has been up, but I desire to inquire does this bill make any provision for an increase in the pay of privates?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not of the lowest-class privates, but it does increase the pay of privates of the first class and of the other enlisted men.

Mr. BORAH. What would it leave the pay of privates?

Mr. WADSWORTH. At \$30 a month.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But they got an increase of 100 per cent.

Mr. BORAH. When?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Two years ago.

Mr. BORAH. An increase from \$15 to \$30 a month. Is it the purpose of those Senators having charge of legislation with reference to these matters to leave the pay of privates at \$30 a month?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BORAH. Then, I am against the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, I regret that the Senator is against the bill on that account. I do not know that I am justified in retracing my steps in explaining to the Senator why the committee took that action.

Mr. BORAH. It may be possible that the committee has a good reason for having done so, but I can not imagine what it could be. It is, perhaps, no argument that the pay of the other men should not be raised, but it is a discrimination which, in my judgment, can not be maintained upon any ground of equity or justice.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I deny that it is a discrimination or that there is anything unjust or inequitable about it. If the Senator from Idaho will listen a moment, I shall try to convince him of that fact. It is very easy to say that things are discriminations and inequitable, but let us see what this case is.

A man enlists in the Army and receives the pay of \$30 a month. He is invariably a bachelor, a young man. He is fed and clothed by the Government; he is housed and sheltered by the Government; he is transported whenever he moves according to the orders of the Government; and all his medical care is given to him by the Government. The \$30 is pocket money. It is perfectly true that \$30 of and by themselves do not attract men into the Army, because the man could probably make twice that amount in civil life.

Mr. BORAH. At least twice that amount.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He could get at least twice that amount in civil life in cash. He gets at least \$60 in civil life, we will say, in cash; but he would have to clothe himself, feed himself, transport himself, pay his own doctor's bill in civil life, which he does not have to do in the Army.

It is utterly impossible for the Government to bid against industrial wages in the matter of the payment of privates upon first enlistment in the Army; it can not be done.

Mr. BORAH. It is equally impossible for the Government to bid against private corporations in the matter of the employment of the men who occupy positions in official life. The Government can not pay the man who works for it what the private corporation will pay men who perform similar work. That is out of the question. Senators who are capable of making \$60,000 or \$100,000 a year at their professions come here and work for \$7,500 a year. The Government can not bid against that situation; there is no use to undertake it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is just what I am saying.

Mr. BORAH. And it ought to apply to one class just as much as to the other.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. BORAH. I will wait until the Senator concludes his statement.

Mr. WADSWORTH. How does the Government get men to go into the Army?

Mr. BORAH. That is a long story.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps the Senator from Idaho desires to answer my question.

Mr. BORAH. There are numerous ways in which the Government gets men to go into the Army, but it certainly does not get them to go into the Army by paying them \$30 a month.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly not; and I was about to explain why. The Government could not get them for even \$50 or \$60 a month.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Government get men to accept the positions in which the salary has been increased for the salary?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, sir; not for the salary alone. A man goes into the Army, in the first place, because that kind of life attracts him; it is a healthy and largely an out-of-door life. He regards it as a manly kind of occupation; it appeals to him. He has what might be called the soldierly instinct; perhaps he has the spirit of adventure. He feels that, perhaps, at some time or other during his enlistment he will encounter some adventure in connection with service in the Army, which will be attractive to him. That accounts very largely for the fact that the Marine Corps is always at war strength. Why? Not because the Marines are paid more than are the soldiers in the Army, for they are paid exactly the same, but the men who enlist in the Marines are of an adventurous nature, who seem to figure out that there is a chance that they may get into a little scrap somewhere, whether it be a little revolution in Central America, or a Boxer rebellion in China, or whatever it is, or may see something of the world. That is what brings them into the service. It is not the money.

Now, what is going to keep a proper percentage of them in the Army? It is the prospect for advancement; the prospect for greater power and influence among their fellows; promotion to first-class private, paying \$9 per month more pay under this bill; promotion to corporal, bringing an even larger increase in pay; promotion to sergeant; and then a settled, secure, honorable status in the Army until they are 64 years old. That is what brings men into the Army and keeps them in the Army.

The trouble has been, I will say to the Senator from Idaho, not that the pay of the private has been too low, but that the pay of the noncommissioned officer has been too low. That pay being too low, there is no inducement or but little inducement for a man to enlist in the Army as a private, because there is no outlook, no prospect for his reaching a good scale of pay and a good status in the service.

It would not make any appreciable difference in our recruiting figures if we should raise the \$30 pay for the private by 20 per cent, as is done for corporals and sergeants and sergeants major; it will not bring any more men into the service. Twenty per cent of \$30 is \$6. If we make the pay of the private \$36 instead of \$30 a month, I venture to say it would not bring in a total of 500 men in addition to what we now get under the \$30 pay. It is what he is going to get after he has been in the service, so that if he gets a square deal and likes the life and reaches the grade of noncommissioned officer, where he can afford to marry and support a family in decency and comfort, then he is happy in the Army. Those are the kind of men we must keep in the Army, for they are the backbone of the Army. So there is nothing unjust about the matter.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand the provisions of the bill, the increases are not for the purpose of inducing officers to come into the Army. Ordinarily the commissioned officer enters the Army as a cadet, and the object of the bill is to prevent the exodus of officers from the Army after we have educated and prepared them for the service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is one of the principal reasons.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am going to support this bill. I would be better satisfied with it if it provided for some increase in the pay of the privates. In that respect I sympathize largely with the position taken by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. I hope that subject may be taken up later; but if such an increase is not to be granted now, that is no reason why we should be unjust to the officers of the Army.

I rose for the purpose of reading into the RECORD a portion of a letter which was written to one of the Representatives in Congress from my State. I know the young man who wrote the letter; he is one of the young officers of whom Ohio is very proud. What he says corroborates the splendid statement made by the chairman of the committee in support of the bill. The letter is a very interesting one and in part is as follows:

I am a Regular soldier and very proud of it, a graduate of West Point; served overseas considerably more than two years; won the distinguished-service medal at the age of 24; but I am also a farm owner and taxpayer from my district. \* \* \* I request your favorable consideration of an increase in pay for Army officers. As you know, the pay has not been increased since 1907, but we are required by law to live as we did then, in a manner "becoming an officer and a gentleman"; required to be well dressed, yet a poorer uniform than I bought in 1916 for \$18



cost me \$126.30 a few months ago. I have not purchased any new shoes or boots since October, 1917, and do not see how I can before February, at the earliest. I have lived in camps or in the field since my graduation. \* \* \* I am a captain and a bachelor, because I can not afford to get married. Were I to get married it would simply mean bringing myself and the girl to downright poverty. How junior married officers live is more than I can see. Many can not and are being driven out of the service, for which they spent the beginning years in training, believing that the Government would at least give them a fair chance to serve it. I would resign myself were it not for the fact that I love the service, ask only a chance to go on serving, and can not believe that the rich and generous United States, that extends charity to all the world, even its late enemies, is going to abandon its faithful service.

The returned soldier is rewarded when he is discharged, but the Regular that sticks is punished. My pay overseas was \$302.50 a month; my reward upon my return was demotion and a loss of \$82.50 a month. I do not care about the rank—I serve where I am placed—and I would not care about the pay were it not a downright hardship.

Over 2,000 Regular Army officers have resigned since the armistice—a fourth of us forced to go out in the world and start anew, with the handicap of years lost in service. That means, too, that they are the bravest and youngest of us. What is the Army going to do when they should have been our leaders? The reason that more of us have not gone is, the situation is unbelievable to the rest of us; but every day more and more are becoming discouraged, losing faith, and leaving behind them our sacred old motto, "Duty, honor, country."

Help to hurry this thing up before more say—to themselves—"Country will not care for me; why should I serve country?"

I know that is shocking, but so is seeing the demoralization of your true and loyal friends, and the terrible lowering of efficiency of the whole Army, our loyal old Army, that has obeyed your commands without asking the why of it since the time of Washington. Is it possible that men can be so selfish that Members of Congress play politics for self-advancement while they ruin what little protection the whole Nation has? Is it keeping their trust with the people? Why has Congress never tried to really understand the Army? Why are we applauded in time of war and damned again before we have returned from it? Why are we heroes when the enemy is in front of us, and scheming plotters, seeking self-advantage, when we try to improve ourselves so that the enemy will not come so near beating us the next time, and so that the next time you will be safer and have fewer sacrifices? Why accuse the Army of everything mean under the sun, when it is well known that your own order is behind us not to speak even in our own defense, and you know we will obey you?

Mr. President, I will not read any more of the letter. I have been long persuaded from the information that I have had that it was necessary for Congress to do something for the Army, and I would extend the scope of this relief to the private.

I realize that I am not in a position to speak authoritatively on that subject, because I am not a member of that committee, and have not had an opportunity to study the subject; but we love to think that every branch of the service, whether it is the military, the naval, the marine, or the civil service, attracts to it the best of the young men of the country, and, in the case of the civil service, the best of the young women of the country; but we can not attract this kind of talent if we are always going to be niggardly and pay to them less compensation than they can go out into private life and get in private employment. I do not think it is anything to the credit of the country to realize that many of these men have to go about almost threadbare in their apparel; and this applies to the civil service as well. I am sure the public does not expect the Congress to deal in a niggardly manner with its servants.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may we complete the committee amendments first?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the pending amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 9, after the word "increases," it is proposed to strike out "50 per cent" and insert "20 per cent: *Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month."

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not going to take any time to discuss this matter, because I am considerably in the position of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE]. Not being a member of the committee, and not having had an opportunity to go into the details, it would be useless for me to undertake to discuss it. I only rise to say that the letter that the Senator from Ohio has read is a much better argument for the position which I assume in regard to this matter than anything I could say. There is not a line nor a phrase in it of argumentative force that does not apply to doing justice to the privates equally with the officers. I suspect that one of the reasons why the matter is not taken up is because necessarily we have to stop somewhere and consider the Treasury, and it is thought that we can do this by piecemeal, and perhaps later take care of the privates. My only fear is that it will not be done at all; that after the bill as it is now proposed is passed, interest in the privates will cease.

I repeat, of course, without any imputation upon the sense of equity and justice of the committee, that to my mind the bill is unfair and discriminatory in undertaking to take care of the

official life, as it were, of the Army, without giving any consideration at all to the interests of the privates.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "twenty" and to insert in lieu thereof "thirty," so that, if amended, it will read:

Thirty per cent: *Provided*, That such increase—

And so forth.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I am only going to make a few remarks in regard to this amendment.

It developed in the address made to the Senate in regard to this bill by the distinguished chairman that the bill carries an increase of 31 per cent to the officers. It is also very apparent upon the face of the bill that it carries an increase of only 20 per cent to a certain part of the body of the privates, not even to all the privates. Unless a private is in class 1 he does not participate in any increase whatever under the provisions of this bill.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the conditions in this country justify any increase of the officers' salaries upon a basis of 31 per cent—and that is what it amounts to when you figure the 10 per cent flat increase and the ration allowance which is also provided—the same conditions that surround the officers and the same elements of justice that surround them also surround the private soldiers, and for my life I can not draw any distinction between the merits of the two cases.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do.

Mr. BORAH. What is the effect of the amendment? I did not catch it as it was read. What does it do?

Mr. TRAMMELL. The effect of the amendment is to allow the privates an increase based upon 30 per cent instead of 20, as provided in the bill.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the amendment does nothing of the sort, if the Senator will permit me. It amends the bill by striking out the words "20 per cent" and inserting the words "30 per cent." The privates of the Army are not affected by this bill at all. The privates of the first class are, and all other enlisted men. The Senator's amendment would not apply to privates as drawn and presented.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I stated in my argument in regard to the matter that there was no increase provided for a certain class of the privates; that they had to be in the first class before they were even entitled to the benefits of the increase.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true; but does the Senator's amendment affect that?

Mr. TRAMMELL. My amendment would effect an increase of 30 per cent, rather than 20 per cent, as provided by the bill, to the class of privates that are within the purview of the bill at present. Then I think the other privates ought also to be put in a class where they would receive a certain increase of compensation.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I notice that after the amendment which the Senator has proposed there is a Senate amendment which reads as follows:

*Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

Suppose that Senate amendment were eliminated. Then the text would read in the particular we are now discussing:

And the pay of all enlisted men and of members of the Female Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy is hereby increased 30 per cent.

If that were the final text, would not that increase apply to all privates under the phraseology of the bill?

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is true; and of course if I succeeded in getting my amendment adopted, I would then offer a further amendment to strike out the proviso, and that would entitle all of the privates, both of the first class and those below the first class, to the increase.

Mr. POMERENE. That was the thought I had in mind when I rose to make the suggestion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to understand: If the amendment of the Senator from Florida is adopted, and then the clause which the Senator from Ohio has read is stricken out, the bill will cover all privates?

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is my understanding of it, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Is that the understanding of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. POMERENE. That was my understanding.

Mr. TRAMMELL. And that would put the privates on an equality with the officers as far as the percentage of increase of salary is concerned, and in all fairness and justice I am unable to see why we should not give them the same percentage of increase that we give the officers.

I have a great deal of appreciation and esteem for the officers who command our Army and who command our Navy, but on account of that esteem and appreciation for them I have no less esteem for the privates who constitute the Navy and constitute the Army. The officers are essential and the privates or enlisted personnel are essential. Take the condition during the recent war: What would have happened if we had had a war carried on only by officers? Instead of our having had a great and glorious victory, our Nation and our allied nations would have gone down in hopeless defeat. So I submit that in justice you must consider the enlisted personnel as well as you consider the officers when you come to dealing with the question of maintaining your Army and when you come to consider the question of morale.

Senators talk about some officers having resigned from the Army. They will keep on doing that, regardless of the salary. There are doubtless some officers who could make more in private industry, and there are a good many more who are enjoying better salaries than they could secure if they went out into the fields of private endeavor. I know quite a good many officers personally. I know of some of them who made some sacrifice in serving their country at the salaries they were getting during the recent war; but, on the other hand, I know of quite a few of them who enjoyed emoluments to the extent of \$500 or \$1,000, or maybe \$1,500, per annum more than they were getting in the private employment in which they were engaged prior to connecting themselves with the Army.

If you are going to argue that they might command greater emoluments in the private walks of life, can you not with equal merit and with equal justice and logic also argue that a great many of the privates can command more in private industries?

It is true that the demands and the necessities of the officers are greater, and I recognize that fact; but when you make an increase based upon a stated percentage of the salary of the officer and the private you necessarily, as far as the number of dollars is concerned, give a great deal more and a much larger sum to the officer. Therefore you are contributing more, even upon the same percentage of increase, to meet the necessities and the requirements of the officer.

Take a major, for instance: At the present time, with his commutation and his salary, he draws from the Government, we will say, approximately \$3,800 or \$3,900, does he not? I will ask the chairman of the committee whether I am correct in that?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It depends upon how long he has been in the service. His base pay is \$3,000.

Mr. TRAMMELL. His base pay is \$3,000. I will say that a major under the present law draws in compensation and for his commutation, lights, and so forth, approximately \$3,800. Now, I am not arguing that he should not have some increase; but what does the average man over this country, who is paying the fiddler, think when you tell him that in the case of an officer who is drawing \$3,800 or \$4,000 per annum you have to increase his salary to the extent of 31 per cent in order that he may meet the necessities of his situation, which would be approximately \$1,200 increase, and in the next breath you tell him that the private who is drawing \$30 a month is getting sufficient because he happens to get a place to sleep and his meals, and that he should not have an increase of \$9 per month; that you would give him no increase whatever?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I am in sympathy with the proposition that the pay of the private should be increased; but, at the same

time, we must be entirely fair about this. The private has his keep, whether it is at a high cost or at a low cost. This only applies to cash pay.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I realize that. I said they would say that he should not have an increase because he was getting a place to sleep, getting shelter, and was being provided with food and raiment, and offered that as an excuse why a private should not have an increase of \$6 per month; and yet an officer, who was already drawing his salary of \$4,000 per annum, should have an increase of \$100 per month, speaking in round figures.

Mr. President, I can not quite discern between the two, why officers should enjoy a 31 per cent increase and the others should enjoy no increase, or that a certain class of the privates should enjoy an increase of only 20 per cent and about half of all of them should not be given any increase whatever. Those omitted are those who receive the smallest salary at present.

Mr. President, I do not feel that we have been dealing quite fairly with the rank and file of the American Army and Navy. Ever since the termination of the war we have been called upon to legislate, and there has been a disposition to legislate, in favor of increasing the salaries of officers, in favor of providing certain special recognition to certain officers on account of the service that they rendered during the war, and a deaf ear, almost, has been turned to the rank and file of the American Army and Navy in the matter of paying a Nation's tribute to them for their valor, for their courage, and for their sacrifices during that terrible conflict which tested the manhood of the Nation.

I submit, Mr. President, that our officers performed a commendable service, that they reflected credit upon themselves, upon the American Army, upon the American Navy, and upon their Nation, and that they are entitled to some recognition. But I also assert, Mr. President, that the private soldier and the officers of lower rank, such as lieutenants and captains, and occasionally a major, who led the charges from the trenches and won victory against a foe which had seemed almost unconquerable and invincible until the time America entered the war, are, too, entitled to a meed of praise and a token of the Nation's gratitude greater than we have given to them.

The average officer does not undergo the hardships that the private undergoes. He lives under more congenial and pleasant surroundings. He has more comfortable quarters. He enjoys a far greater salary, and yet the great rank and file of the Army, who endured the greater hardships, who met the enemy face to face, many of whom sacrificed their lives in defense of their country, are to be passed along until some more convenient season. We say to them, "At some more convenient season we will consider your case." That is no reflection upon the officers. I have no reflection to make upon the officers.

I was astounded and I was chagrined and made to feel ashamed for my country when it developed in a hearing before a meeting of a subcommittee of the Naval Affairs Committee recently that the different commanding officers, in selecting men to be recommended for the Navy cross and the distinguished service medal, overlooked the fact that out of the great number of men in the Navy who were so unfortunate as to not be officers only a very few had been recommended for any kind of special decorations. The excuse was that when the request came for recommending men for special decorations they did not have the records of the enlisted men. I then developed information that they did not have the records of the officers. But those commanding officers, with a great deal of diligence, soon procured the records of the officers, and as a result a very large majority of them were recommended for some special decoration in one form or another. But I say, Mr. President, that the poor enlisted man, who endured the hardships, who served his country for the pittance of \$30 or \$33 a month, was passed over, was forgotten, and he had no friend at court.

I can not bring myself to such a frame of mind, Mr. President, as to feel that it is quite just that we shall keep on and keep on enacting legislation in favor of the more fortunate of our Army, neglecting the interests and the proper consideration, as I see it, of the less fortunate.

Therefore I offer this amendment, and I feel, Mr. President, that justice, the interests of our country, and fair play demand that the amendment be adopted, and that it can not be said, and again said, that the United States Senate practically ignored the great rank and file of the American Army and Navy, and that the Senators wear glasses that could only see the officers. I want all of them to be justly dealt with.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Can the Senator, or some member of the Military Affairs Committee, inform us just what class of enlisted men in the Army and Navy, if any, are given any increase under this bill?



Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I am not sure that, with the peculiar wording, any of them get an increase. If a person reads the bill and does not do a little thinking, he is rather impressed that the enlisted man has been given a 20 per cent increase. But if he reads it closely and dissects it he finds that that is what you would call a little "moonshine," or a little shadow, and that it means nothing so far as doing anything in behalf of the great majority of the enlisted men of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the Senator if, in his experience in business houses and manufacturing establishments, when they undertake to raise salaries it is not a fact that they usually do not confine the raises to the officials, but raise the individual employees as well as the officers?

Mr. TRAMMELL. That is true, Mr. President; and the Congress of the United States has gone on record in that matter in dealing with clerks' salaries. Congress passed a measure providing for a bonus of \$240 per annum to the clerical forces of the Government in various departments, but the limitation placed upon it was that the \$240 should not be paid to persons receiving a salary of more than \$2,500 per annum. Congress has gone on record as considering that those who are not so fortunate as to draw the larger salaries are more entitled to an increase of pay than those who occupy the more fortunate positions and draw the larger salaries.

Of course, some officers might leave the service, as has been stated. But, Mr. President, they are having great difficulty in building up the Army, as far as enlisted men are concerned. I have noticed in my own State within the last few days that they were having meetings for the purpose of trying to encourage the boys of those communities to join the Army. The mayor of Tampa, Fla., one of the large cities of my State, made an address at a meeting held especially for the purpose of encouraging the boys to join the Army. Mr. President, do you think or does any other Senator think that when the report goes out through the press of this Nation that the United States has provided an increase of 31 per cent for all of the officers and has not provided an increase for a very large part of the enlisted personnel of the Army, and this is only 20 per cent, that will be very encouraging news toward getting enlisted men into the Army of this country?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I believe the Senator from Florida is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. Am I correct?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would like to know whether he or any members of his committee had anything to do with the drafting of this bill, which purports to increase the salaries of naval officers as well as Army officers?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I can speak for myself only, as one member of the committee. I knew nothing whatever of it, as far as I myself am concerned, and I know that it was not before the committee for consideration. Whether the individual membership of the committee, different ones, had any knowledge of it I do not know; but it was not given any consideration before the Naval Affairs Committee; and as far as I myself am concerned I will state to the Senator from Massachusetts that if it had been before the committee I would have recorded at least one vote against it in its present form.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So we have before us a bill to increase the pay of Navy and Army officers which has never been referred to, deliberated upon, nor considered by the committee in this Chamber having charge of our naval affairs.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, that statement is correct. I have attended the meetings, and no longer ago than this morning this question was up; but it has not been officially considered by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. As a matter of fact, the Senator knows that the Senate Naval Affairs Committee was considering this morning the House bill on this subject, which was introduced in the House by Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, that is correct; and a further consideration of it was deferred only for the reason that Senator LONGE, of Massachusetts, was absent and asked that it be carried over until he could attend the committee meeting. He was detained on other business this morning.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I yield.

Mr. KING. I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, as is the Senator from Florida. I heard the explanation offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] as to why this bill is rather an omnibus measure, and it seemed to me that it was a very appealing and a very strong reason.

I can readily understand that if the Military Affairs Committee, the Naval Affairs Committee, the committee that has charge of the public health, and some other committee were considering increases in salary and compensation of persons where there is a sort of relation in the character of the service rendered there might be disparities and discrepancies that would lead to heartburnings and to discriminations that would be unfair. It seems to me, therefore, that one committee ought to originate this legislation. But if I had had my way, it would have been a joint committee, representing each of the committees of the Senate that have to deal with those subjects. But the matter having been considered by the Military Affairs Committee, and a bill having been produced which, upon its face at least, seems to be fair, does the Senator think there ought to be a recommendation, or that this bill ought to be defeated because the Naval Affairs Committee did not have anything to do with it?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I made no suggestion of that kind; I had made no reference to that fact and I had not made a motion that it be recommitted. We are guilty of what I consider discrimination in the bill in providing an increase of 31 per cent to officers and only an increase of 20 per cent to a small part of the privates of the Army and Navy, and leaving entirely aloof without any increase whatever a large number of privates of the Army and Navy.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I understood the Senator from Florida to say that this very morning the Committee on Naval Affairs was considering legislation to increase the pay of naval officers, and yet this afternoon in the Senate Chamber we are discussing a bill which was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs actually increasing the pay of naval officers. Am I correct?

Mr. TRAMMELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator will agree that there is enough business here for Senators to do without wasting their time at cross purposes on legislation which different committees have under consideration and which one committee has handled.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I think it would have been better for it to have been considered by a joint committee composed of the membership of the two committees, the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs. I think that would have been better, but of course I did not rise to launch any fight upon that particular feature.

I rose to call to the attention of the Senate what I consider to be a discrimination against the privates, or you might say the rank and file, of the Army and Navy, and to appeal for justice not only for the officers, many of whom enjoy splendid salaries at the present time and live in more or less comfort and affluence, but also for the rank and file of the American Army and Navy.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Gronna	McKellar	Smoot
Brandegee	Harris	Moses	Stanley
Calder	Harrison	New	Sterling
Capper	Kellogg	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Overman	Townsend
Colt	King	Page	Trammell
Dial	Kirby	Phelan	Wadsworth
Fernald	Lodge	Polindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	McCormick	Sheppard	Warren

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The roll of absentees will be called.

The Assistant Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HALE, Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. SPENCER answered to their names when called.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. McNARY] is absent on business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. BALL, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TRAMMELL. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Reading Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Washington (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who is necessarily absent on account of the illness of his wife. During that absence I have agreed to take care of him by pair, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and vote "nay."

Mr. RANDELL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. BALL (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I find he has not voted. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. KELLOGG. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], which I transfer to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and vote "nay."

Mr. DIAL (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], which I transfer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and I will let my vote stand.

Mr. MCCORMICK (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. I note that he is not in the Chamber, therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. WATSON. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER] with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 26, as follows:

## YEAS—24.

Borah	McKellar	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Dial	McNary	Poinindexter	Stanley
Gerry	Norris	Pomerene	Sterling
Gronna	Nugent	Ransdell	Townsend
Harrison	Oberman	Robinson	Trammell
Kenyon	Phelan	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.

## NAYS—26.

Ball	Frelinghuysen	Nelson	Wadsworth
Brandegge	Hale	New	Walsh, Mont.
Calder	Harris	Page	Warren
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Sherman	Watson
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Colt	Kirby	Spencer	
Curtis	Lodge	Sutherland	

## NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Gay	La Follette	Shields
Bankhead	Gore	Lenroot	Simmons
Beckham	Harding	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.
Culberson	Henderson	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Cummins	Hitchcock	McLean	Smoot
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Swanson
Edge	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Thomas
Elkins	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Underwood
Fall	Kendrick	Owen	Wolcott
Fernald	Keyes	Penrose	
Fletcher	King	Phipps	
France	Knox	Reed	

So Mr. TRAMMELL's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The READING CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "10" and to insert "2."

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment is to cut down the increase contemplated for the officers to where they will be drawing an increase of about 23 per cent as against the 20 per cent that is allowed to the enlisted men. The Senate has gone on record in opposition to raising the percentage of increase to privates and enlisted personnel to the percentage provided in the bill for officers. Therefore I desire to test the sentiment of the Senate on the question whether it is desired to cut the officers' increase down to where it will be at least close to the percentage allowed to the enlisted men.

The enlisted men—that is, those that come within the purview of the bill at all—are only allowed 20 per cent. The chairman of the committee stated that the flat increase of 10 per cent and the extra-ration allowance provided in this bill for officers made a total percentage of increase of a fraction less than 31 per cent for the officers. Even those enlisted men who will enjoy the benefits of this bill—and I submit that the proviso is so worded that a great many of them will be excluded from its benefits—will only be allowed a 20 per cent increase.

I first sought to equalize the matter by raising the percentage of the increase of the enlisted men to the percentage of the increase given to the officers; but the Senate, by a vote of 26 to 24, in its wisdom has decided that it does not want to increase the percentage of the salary increase to the enlisted men to a point where it will be equal to that provided for the officers. Therefore I desire now to offer this amendment, and to ascertain whether the Senate is willing, as I see it, to do justice by the enlisted men by bringing the increase proposed for the officers down to a point where it will be only 3 per cent more than that provided for the enlisted men, instead of leaving it approximately 11 per cent more than that given to the enlisted men.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, the Senator in his argument does not give us the information that the private soldier has had his pay doubled since there has been any increase made for the officers.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I do not think the fact that the private soldier might have had his pay increased and the officer did not has any bearing upon the merits of the case. The reason given for increasing the salary of the officer at the present time is that in justice he is entitled to it; that he needs it in order that he may provide the necessities of life. I submit that the private and the enlisted man of this country is living under the same conditions, in the same atmosphere, as far as the value of a dollar is concerned, and has the same proportionate increased demands that the officer has. I think that is an answer to that statement.

Mr. WARREN. But the Senator must, in comparison, admit first that the private soldier's pay has been doubled during the war, and, furthermore, that he has received, if on the other side, 20 per cent in addition to that, where the officer has not had any increase whatever, and gets only 10 per cent increase when he is abroad. Again, so far as the living of the private soldier is concerned, it is all furnished by the Government, except his



tobacco; so that the rise in the cost of living has been on the part of the Government and has not operated against the men.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, it is the same old story of penalizing the man who has been penalized heretofore, and continuing to deprive him of justice and his rights, as I see it. The mere fact that the private soldiers and the men of the Navy in years gone by were only given a little pittance of \$13 and something per month and have had that increased, I say, has no bearing upon the merits of the question at this time. The same logic, the same reasons that you use as to why an officer's salary should be increased, apply with like effect to the private.

If it is a financial problem, if it is a problem of justice, if it is a problem of equalizing the remuneration of a man who is in the Government service with that of people in private industries, then, I say, with like effect and with equal justice you may apply to the enlisted men the same reasons and the same logic that you base your contention upon in behalf of the officers.

I want to reiterate that I appreciate the officers, I appreciate their loyalty and their patriotism and the great work that they did during the recent war. That is not the question. The question is that we are dealing with the American Army and the American Navy; and I submit that this great force of men comprising the Army and the Navy, who, in my opinion—and I do not mean any reflection by the statement—had no representative at court when this bill was prepared, should now be considered and given justice. I would not take from the officer his honor, his credit, nor justice for him; but I think we should deal with equal justice toward the privates, and I reassert that I can not recognize this line of demarcation that is, you might say, the twilight zone, that enables members of the committee to say that an officer should have his salary increased approximately 31 per cent, but that only a small part of the ranks of the Army and of the Navy should have an increase of just 20 per cent. That is the reason why I have offered these amendments, and hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, just a few sentences.

In view of what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] remarked a moment ago, I thought it might be of interest to the Senate for me to say that in drafting this pay bill the committee, of course, had not the slightest intention of discriminating against the enlisted men, whether they be of the grade of private, or private first class, or any of the other enlisted grades, nor of extending to commissioned officers any help over and above that which they need. We simply knew that the pay of the Army as a whole had been last fixed in 1908, that the pay of a portion of the Army had been changed since that period, and in drafting this bill we thought we would make an effort to make the percentage of increases given to all the different grades of the Army, from private up to general, conform somewhat to a definite scheme of progress.

As illustrating that, let me say that if you take the last Army pay schedules which were made for the Army as a whole in 1908, and then take this bill and figure out the percentages of increase given to the officers and men in the several grades, you will find, particularly in relation to the enlisted grades, the following results: That, as compared with the pay of 1908, the pay of the private soldier under this bill will be increased 100 per cent; the pay of the private first class will be increased 120 per cent; the pay of the corporal will be increased 105 per cent; the pay of the staff corporal will be increased 80 per cent; the pay of the line sergeant will be increased 52 per cent; the pay of the staff sergeant will be increased 46 per cent plus; the pay of the battalion sergeant major will be increased 44 per cent. All of these increases are far above the increases received by the officers in the same period of time, which in the aggregate can not exceed 31 per cent.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. How do these increases compare with the salaries fixed in the bill providing for the permanent Military Establishment? Do they provide the same rate of pay for these officers that is provided in that bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not quite.

Mr. KIRBY. I was just trying to find out what the necessity was for two bills.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Army reorganization bill, as will be developed later on, groups several grades into one group, and reduces the number of noncommissioned and enlisted grades of the Army from 49 to 9, but makes no considerable change in the pay of the men who will occupy those new grades; so the discrimination against the enlisted men is not apparent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I have another amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The READING CLERK. It is proposed to amend, page 1, in line 10, by striking out the words:

*Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment will be to allow the enlisted men to draw the 20 per cent which is provided by the committee without having a very large number of them excluded by the proviso. Unless we adopt this amendment striking out the proviso, a very large percentage of them will be excluded from participating in the increase even of 20 per cent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair advise the Senator from Florida that the same conclusion would be reached by voting down the committee amendment in lines 9 and 10.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I do not think so, Mr. President, because the committee amendment strikes out the "50 per cent" that was in the bill as introduced and inserts "20 per cent," so I think we had better have a vote on the amendment as I have offered it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, is the amendment on lines 9 and 10 of the first page and the first and second lines of the second page divisible, so as to vote first on the 20 per cent?

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, my amendment only applies to the proviso. It provides that that shall be stricken from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the amendment could be divided.

Mr. TRAMMELL. There is no reason to divide it, I think. The Senator, I think, was laboring under a misapprehension. He thought it also referred to the percentage, but it does not refer to the percentage.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; that is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York inform us what percentage of the enlisted men will receive a 20 per cent increase in case the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida is adopted?

Mr. WADSWORTH. All of them.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator tell us what percentage of the enlisted men are given an increase under the language of the bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can tell the Senator the percentage, so far as it affects the Army. I can not so far as it affects the Navy. The privates in the Army comprise approximately 48 to 49 per cent of the enlisted strength. They would not receive an increase under this bill. The privates, first class, would receive an increase, and all the other grades from that up.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So that, to put it in another way, the increase would affect 51 per cent of the Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. About 52 per cent.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And that includes all commissioned officers and privates of the first class?

Mr. WADSWORTH. All noncommissioned officers and privates of the first class.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York a question. I notice that the Senator from New York introduced this bill on November 3, and it was reported out on December 8. When the Senator introduced it the bill provided that the increase in the pay of the enlisted man should be 50 per cent. That is stricken out by the committee and 20 per cent inserted. May I ask the Senator whether there was quite a division of the committee on that proposition?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, Mr. President, I do not recollect that there was any marked division. The committee was moved by two considerations, as I recollect it, in reducing the 50 per cent increase to a 20 per cent increase. One of the considerations was that the pay of the privates, privates of the first class, and corporals in the Army had been increased since the last Army readjustment and pay bill had been passed by over 100 per cent, and that it would not be necessary to increase them another 50 per cent in addition.

The second consideration was that the Treasury of the United States has a limit in its resources, and that we could not afford to raise the pay of all the enlisted men of the Army by 50 per cent.

Mr. HARRISON. Some of us on this side have a very high respect for the Senator's judgment in this matter, and seeing that he was of the opinion on November 3 that it should be increased 50 per cent and that this change was made by the committee on December 8, may I ask the Senator whether the committee convinced him that he was wrong in thinking that it should be 50 per cent?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very frankly, yes; I think I was wrong, after having seen what the increase would amount to and the recruiting figures. The Senator must remember that the amendment applies to the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, and the Public Health Service.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand. I was just curious to know whether the Senator was convinced that he was wrong.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We went into the matter at great length with a number of officers and enlisted men. We had enlisted men before us, very interesting men, who had served for a long time in the Army and Navy, and asked them about it. They talked to us in a very straight and very manly, square way. The emphasis was placed on the necessity of helping those persons in the Army who are married, not the persons in the Army who are bachelors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GRONNA. May the amendment to the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In section 1, page 1, strike out the proviso beginning on line 10, after the words "per centum," in the proposed amendment of the committee. The proviso reads:

*Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Assistant Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore, I vote "nay."

Mr. DIAL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and vote "yea."

Mr. McCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], which I transfer to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], and vote "nay."

Mr. MOSES (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement previously made with reference to my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before with reference to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent on account of the illness of his wife and I promised to take care of him during his absence. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and vote "yea."

Mr. RANSDELL. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 25, as follows:

#### YEAS—25.

Dial	Kenyon	Ransdell	Sterling
Gerry	McKellar	Reed	Townsend
Gronna	McNary	Robinson	Trammell
Harris	Nugent	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Harrison	Overman	Simmons	
Hitchcock	Poin Dexter	Smith, Ga.	
Jones, Wash.	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.	

#### NAYS—25.

Brandegge	Hale	Nelson	Walsh, Mont.
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Warren
Capper	Kellogg	Page	Watson
Chamberlain	King	Phelan	Wolcott
Cummins	Kirby	Spencer	
Curtis	Lodge	Sutherland	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Wadsworth	

#### NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lenroot	Shields
Ball	France	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Gay	McLean	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Gore	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Harding	Myers	Stanley
Colt	Henderson	Newberry	Swanson
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Thomas
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Underwood
Edge	Kendrick	Penrose	Williams
Elkins	Keyes	Philpps	
Fall	Knox	Pittman	
Fernald	La Follette	Sherman	

So Mr. TRAMMELL's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to reserve the right when the bill gets into the Senate to have a vote on the first amendment which I offered, and also on the amendment just voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments may be offered then. It is not necessary to reserve the right to offer the amendments in the Senate.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The vote just taken having been a tie, I desire to have a recapitulation of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be recapitulated.

The Assistant Secretary recapitulated the vote.

Mr. PITTMAN. I vote "yea."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from Nevada was not in the Chamber at the time the result of the vote was announced. Can we open up the roll call again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator has no right now to vote.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed to a new roll call on the amendment to the amendment. I think that is only fair. I think the Senate of the United States ought to have a right to say how it wants to vote.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like very much to know what my privileges are. I understood that the Secretary was tabulating the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was a recapitulation. The vote had already been announced.

Mr. GRONNA. I renew my request for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that there be a new roll call.

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. WARREN. I understand objection has been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator from New York if he intends to finish the bill to-day?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is up to the Senate. I should like—

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows whether he has it in his mind to finish it to-day. As he knows, there is some injustice in the bill with reference to the noncommissioned officers, and I am quite sure the Senator will agree with me that it ought to be remedied. I am not in a position now to draw the proper amendment, because, as the Senator has suggested, it must be very carefully drawn. In all justice to those men, it seems to me the amendments ought to be prepared and at least we ought to have an opportunity to vote on them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am in sympathy with what the Senator from North Dakota desires to bring about with respect to quarters for noncommissioned officers. It is very difficult at this moment to say whether I can support such an amendment until I know the final action of the Senate on the amendments which will be offered again in the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL].

Mr. GRONNA. I understand that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator from Florida succeeds to-morrow in increasing the pay of all the enlisted men 30 per cent, I think then the amendment suggested by the Senator from North Dakota is not necessary. If the Senator from Florida does not succeed in that, I will join with the Senator from North Dakota in endeavoring to provide quarters under the bill for the men whom he and I have discussed.

Mr. GRONNA. I was quite sure the Senator from New York was in sympathy with my suggestion. It is after 4 o'clock now—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let us finish the committee amendments.

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be very glad to finish the committee amendments, but I suggest to the Senator from New York that after they have been disposed of we should adjourn until to-morrow.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. LODGE. There is one other amendment with regard to the district superintendents of the Coast Guard, which I think can be disposed of in a few minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May we proceed with the committee amendments first? They will only take a moment, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee amendment pending is on page 1, line 9, where it is proposed to strike out "50 per cent" and insert:

Twenty per cent: *Provided*, That such increase shall not apply to enlisted men whose initial pay, if it has already been permanently increased since April 6, 1917, is now less than \$33 per month.



Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is that question divisible?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not divisible.

Mr. HARRISON. Can we not vote first on the question of striking out "50 per cent" and inserting "20 per cent" and then vote on the proviso?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not divisible under Rule XVIII. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. What is the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was not a sufficient number.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask that the other side be counted.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	Nugent	Spencer
Brandegee	Harrison	Overman	Stanley
Capper	Hitchcock	Page	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Phelan	Trammell
Cummins	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Curtis	King	Pomerene	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kirby	Robinson	Warren
Fernald	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	McCormick	Smith, Ga.	
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, S. C.	
Hale	New	Smoot	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 28, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 27, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Conden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we seek Thy holy influence that we may be guided in the duties of the hour. If haply we may feel after Thee, and find Thee, though Thou be not far from every one of us: for in Thee we live, and move, and have our being.

In the midst of peace we are in war, since we are a twofold being, physical and spiritual. We need the incarnation of Thy spirit that we may beat down the animal and rise to the spiritual and thus meet the obligations of life; and so rise to the better part, living for the things that are eternal and thus gain an eternal crown. After the similitude of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for one day, on account of important business.

To Mr. SEARS, for 10 days, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. ELLIOTT, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. THOMPSON (at the request of Mr. RICKETTS), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

### SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12046, the second deficiency appropriation bill. And pending that motion I desire to see if we can not agree on time for general debate.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What time does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. GOOD. I have urgent requests for time on this side aggregating two hours and a half. I think it will take 20 minutes to explain the bill, which will make three hours' time asked for on this side.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Then I suppose the same time will be taken for this side. I would be perfectly willing to agree on a less time.

Mr. GOOD. I have tried hard to hold down the requests to less time than that, but I do not think we can get along with much less.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are these three hours to be devoted to the bill or will we have a political harangue?

Mr. GOOD. Thirty minutes will be devoted to the bill. I think the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] has prepared a speech on another subject, and I think there are one or two speeches on other subjects on that side. I think the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] desires to speak on the general subject of hospitals, which is more or less connected with the bill. I have not tried to regulate the matter as to what Members shall speak about.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. Of course the gentleman and that side of the House are responsible for facilitating the business and getting through this measure. I want to inquire whether the gentleman shares the views of the majority leader in his declaration that he hopes to get away from here on the 1st of June?

Mr. GOOD. I have not given any consideration to when we shall get away. I think it is more important that we should do the work necessary to be done. If we can do the work and get away by the 1st of June, I shall be glad of it; but I do not believe we can do it. I do not know what the plans are.

Mr. GARNER. I asked the question in view of the fact that the gentleman is asking for six hours' general debate on this bill, 10 per cent of which will be devoted to the bill and 90 per cent to general debate. That does not look much like facilitating business.

Mr. GOOD. Here is a bill that carries \$88,000,000. The estimates were for \$134,000,000. I do not believe that six hours is an unreasonable length of time.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. I notice the bill says "appropriations for deficiencies for the year ending 1920 and prior fiscal years." How many fiscal years are we appropriating for?

Mr. GOOD. There are one or two items where there was a deficit running back to the years 1915, 1916, and 1917.

Mr. LITTLE. If we are going that far back we may need more than six hours' general debate. [Laughter.]

Mr. GOOD. Those matters will be discussed under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask whether there will be any rule brought in making in order any possible sums or amounts that may be in this bill that are now unauthorized by law?

Mr. GOOD. I hope no such contingency will arise.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point that no quorum is present, and evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, the Sergeant at Arms was directed to notify absentees. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Davey	Graham, Pa.	Madden
Andrews, Md.	Dooling	Graham, Ill.	Mansfield
Ashbrook	Doughton	Hamill	Martin
Bacharach	Dunbar	Hamilton	Mason
Benham	Dunn	Haugen	Moon
Booher	Eagan	Hayden	Moore, Ohio
Britten	Eagle	Houghton	Morin
Burke	Edmonds	Howard	Mudd
Candler	Elliott	Jeffers	Neely
Caraway	Elston	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nicholls, S. C.
Carew	Emerson	Johnston, N. Y.	Nolan
Cass	Ferris	Kahn	O'Connell
Cassey	Fields	Kelley, Mich.	Osborne
Christopherson	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker
Clark, Fla.	Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter
Cooper	Foster	Knutson	Reavis
Copley	Fuller, Mass.	Larsen	Reed, N. Y.
Costello	Godwin, N. C.	Longworth	Reed, W. Va.
Cramton	Goldfogle	McCulloch	Rowan
Crowther	Goodall	McKinley	Rowe
Curry, Calif.	Gould	McPherson	Sabath

Sanders, La.  
Sanders, N. Y.  
Sanford  
Schall  
Scott  
Scully  
Sears

Sells  
Sinclair  
Small  
Smith, N. Y.  
Snell  
Snyder  
Stephens, Miss.

Stoll  
Sullivan  
Temple  
Thompson  
Volstead  
Ward  
Wason

Watkins  
Whaley  
Winslow  
Woodyard

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to dispense with further proceedings under the call. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending consideration of the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the second deficiency bill, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to six hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] and the remainder by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill be limited to six hours, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from South Carolina. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman from South Carolina proceed? [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of the speech made by Admiral William S. Sims on the south steps of the Treasury April 21, 1919. This copy is marked "Released for morning papers April 22, 1919."

Admiral Sims is a modest man. He knew, however, that his appearance upon the steps of the Treasury would excite the applause of the audience, and, therefore, in preparing his speech he wrote:

I should like first to be sure that you understand that the tribute of your applause to me is not taken by me to be personal.

The admiral having thus applauded himself, proceeded to write a very good speech. Among other things, he said:

Now, usually after a great war the leaders on the different sides spend their declining years in writing books to explain that the other fellow was at fault. There will be nothing of that following this war.

Shortly after making this promise he violated it. He wrote a book. Read that book and you will clearly see that the admiral has convinced himself that he, and he alone, won the war. But, while this book was gratifying to his vanity and the remuneration was satisfying to his pocketbook, still it was not sensational enough to win the publicity for which he ever yearns. He therefore determined to spend his declining years writing letters explaining that his superior officers were all at fault, and that he had to win the war in spite of them. Now, in April, 1919, he greatly deplored criticisms made by returning soldiers. In his Treasury speech he said:

They may have been charged 5 cents too much in a canteen, or they may have run across a Britisher or an Italian or a Frenchman that they had a row with. They come back with all sorts of small criticisms. For the Lord's sake, don't pay any attention to that, and don't pay any attention to the people in this country that are yapping at John Pershing's heels.

And all right-thinking Americans applauded his statement, because the people of America had reached the conclusion that the Army of the United States, entering the greatest war in the history of the world, had won the admiration of the people of every allied country and the respect of the people of the enemy countries.

For the Navy there was naught but praise. Out of the war it had come with flying colors. The Navy had done a good job, and Americans were proud of it. They knew, of course, that in an undertaking of such magnitude mistakes were made, but they believed them to be minor mistakes, and for the success of the Navy they gave credit to the entire Naval Establishment, from the Secretary of the Navy down to the rawest recruit.

From the enlisted men as they returned to civil life there was no criticism. They were proud of their service. But while these boys, many of whom had braved the perils of the seas and the deadly submarine, were praising the Navy and the manner in which its operations were conducted, Admiral Sims, who faced nothing more deadly than the dining tables of London, began on December 17 the greatest battle of his career—the Battle of the Medals. Protesting to the Secretary of the Navy because certain officers of his staff on shore duty were not awarded medals as recommended by him, he wrote:

All individual duties afloat are necessarily of secondary importance in comparison with the vital importance of directing all operations, both ashore and afloat, in such manner as to insure the success of the whole.

Again, referring to the failure of the Secretary to award medals to staff officers whose duties were ashore, while awarding medals to officers who served at sea, he says:

This seems to be due to an erroneous opinion as to the relative value of services at sea and in certain vitally important positions ashore—an opinion that duty in the latter positions must necessarily be the least distinguished.

Well, it may be an erroneous opinion, but it certainly was the opinion expressed by this same Admiral Sims in April, 1919, when he declared in his speech on the Treasury steps:

For such success as I and my staff have had on the other side, in this guidance, I am willing to accept your gratitude, but I want to make this point very distinct, that the operations on the other side were not my operations; they were, generally speaking, the fighting of individual ships against an elusive enemy, so that our success depended upon the efficiency of those ships in the material sense and upon the efficiency and the initiative of their personnel.

Then he declared that the success of our naval expedition abroad was due not to the operation of his staff ashore, but to the initiative and efficiency of the officers at sea. Now he declares that the duties of the men at sea must always be secondary in importance to the service of those ashore who direct the operations. You know, as I read that Treasury speech, I began to doubt whether he ever wrote it. There is in it too much common sense and too much real Americanism. [Applause.]

This remarkable epistle to the Secretary of the Navy concludes with the declaration that, inasmuch as the officers recommended by him for medals were not to receive them, he declined to accept the decoration offered him. This was not surprising to me. Having had conferred upon him by the British Government the title of Grand Commander of St. Michael and St. George, no decoration of the United States Government could have any attraction for this distinguished admiral, who long since justly won the title of the "best British admiral in the American Navy." [Applause.]

Now, I know not what has inspired Admiral Sims to embark upon the policy of criticism he so greatly deplored back in April, 1919. Whether he is inspired by personal resentment against the Secretary of the Navy because the Secretary would not permit him to dictate the policies and the appointments of the Navy, or whether, since his assignment to Newport, the inhabitants of that fashionable resort who have never loved the Secretary of the Navy, by playing upon the inordinate vanity of this drawing-room admiral, have inspired his attacks, I do not know. But I do know that every right-thinking American who reads his last letter, wherein he sets forth what he styles "Lessons of the war," will agree with me that in addition to the lessons submitted by him there is another lesson to be learned by us, namely, that while the fact that a man is born under a foreign flag should not necessarily debar him from being placed in command of American naval forces, it should at least cause us to make certain that such a man is able to forget the place of his birth and give wholehearted, undivided allegiance to the Government of the United States. [Applause.]

Admiral Sims was born under the British flag, and he seems unable to get over it. A newspaper correspondent has stated that the reason why Sims was selected for the service as naval representative in London was because it was believed he could "get along" with the English. Well, that certainly was a reasonable assumption. Sims can not "get along" without the English. By the fortunes of war the cause of Great Britain in this war became the cause of America, and by his appointment no great harm was done. But even as between allies there come times when our Government may want from its representative abroad the viewpoint, not of Great Britain, but of America, and there is no man familiar with Sims's record who believes he is capable of entertaining a purely American view.



The naval history of this Government will fail to disclose anything comparable with the contemptible insubordination shown by Admiral Sims in his recent letter to the Secretary of the Navy. [Applause.] Declaring that he was writing for the purpose of setting forth errors which would serve as a guide in the future, he says at the outset that he received only brief instructions as he left for Europe, but did receive the specific admonition, "Do not let the British pull the wool over your eyes. It is none of our business pulling their chestnuts out of the fire. We would as soon fight the British as the Germans." Is it not remarkable that while he does not set forth any other instruction given to him that he should publish to the world the admonition he alleges that he received at the department, knowing, as he did, that its publication was liable to disrupt the friendly relations now existing between this country and Great Britain? [Applause.] What lesson does it teach other than that he can not be trusted? [Applause.]

The careful reader noted that while he endeavored to create the impression that this statement was made to him by Secretary Daniels, Sims, as a matter of fact, did not say who admonished him. Secretary Daniels, in order to prevent any misunderstanding on the part of Great Britain, immediately denied emphatically that he had made to Sims any such statement. [Applause.] Admiral Sims must be made to say who gave him the admonition he alleges he received. If no one gave him such an admonition, then his statement is deliberately false. If some superior officer did so admonish him, it was a confidential instruction to a man leaving upon an official mission, and his violation of the confidence of his superior officer is an act of insubordination which will merit the condemnation of every patriotic American citizen and should cause his dishonorable discharge from the Navy. [Applause.]

Even if what he says is true, and some superior officer having in mind the fact that we were at that time not at war with Germany did admonish him as he alleges, the admonition was justified by his previous conduct. In 1910, speaking in the Guildhall, London, the love of his mother country inspired him to pledge that if she ever engaged in war she "could rely upon the last ship, the last dollar, the last man, and the last drop of blood of her kindred over the sea." He was promptly reprimanded by President Taft. His undertaking to speak for the Government of the United States and to pledge the blood of our people would be funny if it were not for the position he then held and still occupies. At the time he claims he was admonished not to let the British pull the wool over his eyes we were at peace with the world, but any admonition that carried the intimation that this country would not do what he pledged it to do in 1910 necessarily aroused his resentment.

If he now cares so little about violating the confidential instructions of his superior officers, does any man believe that he has not long since told officials of the Government of Great Britain that he received this admonition when he left for Europe? If he will tell it now, what sense of duty would prevent him from telling it during his service abroad? Is his example to be followed by officers of the Army and Navy and diplomatic representatives of this Government? Have we reached the time that while we are at peace the officers of this Government, charged with the direction of its policy, can not admonish an officer about to leave on a quasi secret mission without having their confidence thereafter published to the world? I confidently believe that in all the Army and in all the Navy there is no other officer who cares so little for the country that has honored him that he would endanger the peace of the Nation in order to gratify his personal spite.

I know that some who would like to defend this man will say that his letter was written to the Secretary of the Navy and was published only because a United States Senator called upon him to read it. But who believes this? Senator PITTMAN stated on the floor of the Senate that while he was cross-examining Admiral Sims, Senator HALE, seemingly hostile to the Secretary of the Navy, asked Senator PITTMAN to desist in order that Admiral Sims might read a letter he had. Thereupon, Senator PITTMAN says, Admiral Sims pulled out of his pocket the letter addressed to Secretary Daniels and proceeded to read it. How did he happen to have in his pocket this letter which was in no way relevant to the question of medals about which he was testifying? And how did Senator HALE know that he had it in his pocket? It bears all the earmarks of a frame-up. Did Admiral Sims say, in response to the request that he read it, that the letter contained references to confidential orders given him, the publication of which might endanger the continued peace of this Nation? No.

Outside of this indefensible effort to disturb the peace of this Nation, what is in his letter? Only a series of complaints that the Navy Department failed to conduct the war in accordance

with his advice. He alleges that the Navy Department did not send him as many ships as he requested, which, of course, means as many as the British Admiralty requested, to assist in the protection of allied shipping; that the department assigned to the convoying of American troops and the protection of the coasts of this country ships that should have been sent to Great Britain, and as a result, his opinion is that victory was delayed and thousands of lives lost.

Well, I presume it is but natural for every man to believe that the service in which he was engaged was most essential to victory and to conclude that his suggestions, if adopted, would have hastened the defeat of the enemy. We recall that daily we were told that "Food will win the war," "Ships will win the war," and "Only by mastery of the air will we win the war." But while the British Admiralty and Sims were asking that all of our vessels be sent to the submarine zone to protect allied shipping, the English Army, sorely pressed in France, was urging that we send troops to them to assist in holding the onrushing Germans. And whatever Sims may think about it, Americans will rejoice that the Secretary of the Navy, while sending him as many ships as possible, retained sufficient of our war vessels to safely transport across the sea the 2,000,000 sons of America who, with their allies, smashed the Hindenburg line and brought the war to a victorious end. [Applause.] The Secretary of the Navy had to decide between protecting allied shipping and protecting American transports. Sims wanted him to protect the supplies. Daniels preferred to protect the boys.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will.

Mr. HUSTED. The gentleman has stated that if Admiral Sims received a communication from an officer of the Navy Department as alleged by him, that for revealing that communication he should be dishonorably discharged from the naval service of the United States. I should like to ask the gentleman, if as a matter of fact a communication was made to him on the eve of his departure that we would just as soon fight Great Britain as fight Germany, whether in his opinion the officer of the Navy Department who made that statement should not be immediately removed from the service of the United States?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. In the first place, in answer to the gentleman, Secretary Daniels has denied that he made that statement. In the second place, I said before and say now, that in view of Sims's record, in view of the statement made by him in London pledging the last dollar and the last drop of blood of our people in case Great Britain ever became engaged in war, it behooved any officer who sent him on any mission to warn him against his evident pro-British tendencies that might involve this country in war when we wished to avoid war if it was possible to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not. At the conclusion of my remarks I will yield for any question asked me, but I wish to go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Sims now alleges that our failure to cooperate as he suggested embarrassed our allies, and yet in his Treasury speech he made this statement:

Now, we are willing to admit, we Navy men who are not particularly modest, that our Navy has done a stunt on the other side to the satisfaction of the Allies with whom we cooperated.

Then we cooperated and we did a stunt to the satisfaction of our allies. Now he says that by reason of the inefficient administration of Secretary Daniels the whole job was bungled and our allies embarrassed.

In connection with that I will divert for a few moments to refer to what he said on this subject. After detailing wherein the department failed to grant him the support he asked for, especially in personnel, he produced a letter, dated December 23, 1917, reading as follows:

DECEMBER 23, 1917.

From: Vice Admiral Sims.

To: The Secretary of the Navy.

2366. Your 1732. I strongly deprecate any effort to create an impression that our naval forces in European waters have been avoidably hampered by failure of the Navy Department to comply with my recommendations for various things, particularly personnel.

It is, of course, well known that the antisubmarine campaign and the protection of allied shipping have been and still are hampered to a considerable extent by insufficient numbers of certain types of vessels, especially destroyers, and by certain classes of personnel, and I have repeatedly made recommendations in accordance with the requirements on this situation. To these recommendations the department has always responded with the assurance that reinforcements of both vessels and personnel were being sent to the maximum extent consistent with the many other requirements of the department in these respects.

The decision as to the relative importance of the employment of our naval vessels and personnel in the theater of actual war operations in European waters and at home must necessarily rest with the department, and I consider it the first duty of those at the front loyally

to accept such decisions and to make the best of conditions which are at present admittedly unsatisfactory and must so remain until the energetic measures now being taken to increase our antisubmarine forces produce the necessary reinforcements.

SIMS.

Mr. WELTY. What is the date of that statement?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. December 23, 1917. That letter was written to the department, and it was written with a view of having it sent to the Congress of the United States, stating that the department was cooperating with him to the fullest extent possible at that time. [Applause.]

Since his return, when he concluded to enter upon this campaign of criticism against the Secretary of the Navy, there was nothing he could criticize the department about except its alleged failure to support him as he requested. Now, he knew that this letter rested in the files of the department and that whenever he entered upon this campaign of criticism the Secretary would produce it and thereby brand as untrue every complaint that he made.

Therefore Sims determined to anticipate its production by Daniels and produce it himself, even though it demanded that he make the humiliating confession that every statement he then wrote was untrue. Now he asks us to believe that he is telling the truth when he says that what he then said was untrue. Can you beat it? [Applause.]

Now, what explanation does Sims give of his sending this cable of alleged untruths? Whenever a man voluntarily admits that he has told an untruth, he must necessarily offer an explanation. Therefore he says he concluded from the cables of Daniels and Benson that they wanted him to state what was untrue. Let me read Secretary Daniels's cable to him. He produced it:

DECEMBER 22, 1917.

From the Secretary of the Navy to Vice Admiral Sims, London.

1732. At House committee hearing of conduct of Navy, Representative BRITTES said: "I would like to have copy of complaints which have come from Admiral Sims on the other side." If you desire to make statement of action of department in reference to sending and supplying force under your command since war began, please send in code.

DANIELS.

Would any honorable man, reading that letter, regard it as a plea to willfully misstate the facts? Neither did the cable of Admiral Benson say or intimate that the department desired him to make an untrue statement. It reads as follows:

DECEMBER 22, 1917.

From the Chief of Naval Operations to Vice Admiral Sims, London.

Effort being made to create impression you have been hampered by failure of Navy Department to meet your request for various things, particularly personnel. I feel that a strong, positive statement on this subject from you is highly desirable.

BENSON.

Did Benson tell him to make a strong, positive statement that was untrue? Oh, no! But granting that Sims was honestly mistaken in construing these cables as inviting him to misrepresent the facts, I think we can agree that such invitations are not generally accepted. Sims therefore offers two reasons for his conduct in misrepresenting the facts, first, that he had to reach a decision, not common to a military commander, to tell what was untrue in order to support his superior officer. Think of Sims being so loyal to a superior officer that he was willing to tell for him that which was untrue! And, second, that if he cabled the truth the facts would be debated on the floor of the House by the Members of Congress, and valuable information would thereby reach the enemy. This admiral who does not now hesitate to publish to the world confidential instructions from the Navy Department was then so awfully careful about what he said, that he feared that if he sent a cable message in code to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary, in whom all of the secrets of the department were reposed, would have so little sense and so little patriotism as to make the message public, so that it would reach the ears of the enemy! Or he believed what is not very complimentary to this House, that if Daniels sent his message to the Naval Committee—the committee that at all times had the secrets of the Navy—they would take his cablegram and debate it on the floor and thus make available to the enemy facts that would give him aid and comfort. Do you believe it? You must judge whether he told the truth on December 23, 1917, or whether he is telling the truth now when he says that his former statement was willfully false. To me the conclusion is irresistible that Sims, knowing that letter would completely refute his charges, produced it simply to anticipate its production by the Secretary of the Navy.

I am no naval expert. I know not the reasons actuating the department in having Admiral Benson or Admiral Mayo direct the operations of the American fleet, but, from the bottom of my heart, I rejoice that absolute power was not placed in Ad-

miral William S. Sims. I am satisfied that the force under his command succeeded not because of him, but in spite of him. If left to him I know there would have been no independent activity on the part of the American Navy. While Pershing was fighting for an American Army, independent of other armies, but cooperating with them, Sims was trying to place all activities of our Navy under the British Admiralty. Admiral Wilson, in charge of the naval forces in French waters, maintained his force separate and apart from the French Navy and did a good job. I have no doubt that his pure and unadulterated Americanism was exceedingly distasteful to Admiral Sims. Wilson was of equal rank with Sims. Technically he was serving under Sims abroad, but in actual operation he was acting under the directions of the Chief of Operations here. Naval men abroad knew that Sims' insane jealousy of Wilson made it difficult for Wilson at times, but he never complained. Wilson carries no press agents upon his staff. He fights his battles upon the sea, not in the press. Sims did not like Wilson's conduct. It was stated abroad that he could not get along with Admiral Strauss. He says that Benson, Mayo, and the General Board of the Navy were all wrong. They were all out of step but Sims.

But it was not my purpose to comment in detail upon Sims' letter. I have no doubt that when given an opportunity Secretary Daniels and the General Board of the Navy will give to the American people a satisfactory explanation of why they did not adopt the recommendations of Sims as to how the Navy should be conducted during the war.

My purpose in referring to the matter at all is to advise this House and the American people that Sims not only belittled the achievements of the Navy of the United States but slandered the Army of the United States. I charge that he made false statements as to both the Army and the Navy. My colleagues know that during my nine years of service I have not been given to making reckless statements. In October, 1918, with two of my colleagues, Representative Glass, of Virginia, and Representative WHALEY, of South Carolina, I went to France, and, among other places, visited Tours, the headquarters of the Services of Supply of our Army, and was thrilled with pride at the marvels worked by this branch of the service. On October 30, with my colleagues, I saw Admiral Sims, who was then in Paris. I shall never forget that interview. The armistice had been requested by the enemy. Sims told us of the magnificent progress made by the British on the English front, and as we listened he proceeded to tell us that the armistice would have to be granted because Pershing had been unable to break through the German lines, owing to the absolute breakdown of transportation behind the American lines. With pathos in his voice he told us how unfortunate it was that this breakdown occurred at so critical a moment. In amazement we listened, and in the monologue he delivered he proceeded to tell us that while Americans believed their Navy was working wonders, that as a matter of fact we had but 3 per cent of the antisubmarine craft in English waters; that Great Britain had brought over two-thirds of our troops and had escorted one-half of them. I left him not only depressed at the failure of the American Army but humiliated at the small part played by the American Navy.

Believing that this disaster to the American Army, which, according to Sims, made necessary our granting the armistice asked by the enemy, was destined to become a national scandal, Mr. WHALEY and I determined to again visit the headquarters of the Services of Supply in order to ascertain the details of this disaster. Because of Sims' statement we traveled 150 miles or more to Tours. When we informed the commanding officer and the Chief of Staff of our desire to secure information with reference to this matter they were amazed. They advised us that it was the first they had heard of it. They showed us records where Gen. Pershing, after the St. Mihiel drive, had thanked the Services of Supply for its wonderful service, and again, just a few days prior to our visit, had written congratulating the Services of Supply upon its continued success in supplying our forces in the field. Wishing to avoid friction between our officers, we refrained from disclosing the source of our information. When told that our statement must be mere gossip in Paris, we advised the commanding officer that our information came from an officer of high rank in the service of our Government, and in response to that statement an officer present said:

That is nothing but British propaganda, and the only American officer who could have told you gentlemen this story is Admiral W. S. Sims.

[Laughter and applause.]

I regret that I do not now remember which one of the officers made the statement, but the significance of the statement greatly impressed me.



While in Paris I read in the Paris edition of a London newspaper an account of a speech made by Sims in London, in which he misrepresented the part played by our Navy, just as he had in his statement to us in Paris. Belittling the achievements of America was his hobby in those days. From the London Times of October 11, 1918, I took the following, which also appears in the London Times's History of the World War. It is an account of a speech made by Sims the day previous at a luncheon at the Criterion Restaurant:

Another idea was sometimes in the American mind, that the American Navy had been doing the bulk of the business over here—at least a half. That was not correct. There were about 5,000 antisubmarine craft operating day and night, and the American craft numbered 160, or 3 per cent. The figures were about the same in the Mediterranean. Again, Americans seemed to regard it as a miracle of their Navy that they had got a million and a half troops here in a few months and had protected them on the way. "We didn't do that," said Admiral Sims. "Great Britain did. She brought over two-thirds of the men and escorted one-half. We escorted only one-third of the merchant vessels that come here."

This statement, untrue as it is, was made by him not once, but on every occasion that he had an opportunity to speak. Only this morning a Member of this House told me that Admiral Sims made the same statement to him, and left him humiliated at the part the American Navy was playing in European waters. An American editor told me that in a period of two weeks he had heard him make three or four speeches in London, and on each occasion, speaking for an hour, Sims had devoted 20 minutes to a futile effort to tell negro stories and the other 40 minutes to depreciating the achievements of the American Navy. On each occasion these Americans were forced to listen to him repeat the statements made in the article quoted above from the London Times, and which, from his own reports, I will prove to be false.

He says first that there were 5,000 antisubmarine craft operating day and night and the American craft numbered 160, or 3 per cent. The statement as to the number of craft operating is deceptive and the statement as to the number of American craft is false. Records of the Navy Department show that of the 5,000 antisubmarine craft to which he refers 1,520 were trawlers, 1,365 drifters, 507 motor launches. This accounts for more than 3,000 of the total of 5,000. In his efforts to make the world believe that Great Britain was doing all of the work, he counted as antisubmarine craft everything afloat, in order to increase the percentage of Great Britain and decrease the percentage of American craft engaged. That was deception. But his statement as to the number of American vessels employed is false. His own report of April 4, 1919, contained in Monthly Bulletin No. 5, published at London, shows, on page 11, that on October 11, 1918, Sims had under his command 323 vessels. And on November 11, 1918, there were 373 United States naval vessels in European waters, including 70 destroyers, 5 gunboats, 5 coast-guard cutters, 120 submarine chasers, 27 Army yachts, 12 submarines, 13 mine sweepers, and 10 mine planters, making in all 262 vessels engaged in operation against the submarines instead of 160 as stated by him in his various speeches.

Either one of two things is certain: Sims was so busy fighting the war over the dining tables of London that he did not know how many ships he had under his command, or else, knowing the facts, he willfully misrepresented them in order to pay tribute to the British Navy and belittle the work of the American Navy. [Applause.]

As to the other statement he so constantly made as to the transportation of troops, that "Great Britain brought over two-thirds and escorted one-half," I wish to prove by his own reports that this statement is untrue. In Bulletin No. 5, published May 15, 1919, on page 7, Admiral Sims, under the heading, "A Brief Résumé of the Accomplishments of the United States Navy in European Waters," says: "First, escorted 62 per cent or about 1,250,000 troops of the United States Expeditionary Forces to Europe without loss from enemy action." So that after making, to everybody who would listen to him, the statement I have quoted from his speech as it appears in the London Times, that we had escorted but one-half of the troops taken abroad, in May, 1919, he was willing to concede that his former statement was untrue, and that we had escorted 62 per cent instead of 50 per cent. But what is the fact? The records of the United States Cruiser and Transport Force, prepared by Americans and published as an appendix to the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1919, shows that of the 2,079,680 American troops transported to Europe 1,720,360, or 82.75 per cent, were under United States escort. Having slandered the Navy during the war, six months after the war he was willing to tell half the truth and concede that we escorted 62 per cent, but he never could bring himself to tell the whole truth and admit that the United States Navy had escorted 82 per cent of the boys who went abroad.

Now as to his other statement, made to his London audience, and made to us, that Great Britain had transported two-thirds of our troops to Europe. The report of the Secretary of the Navy shows that 46.25 per cent of our troops were carried abroad in United States vessels, and Sims' statement that we carried only 33 per cent is as untrue as every other statement he has made with reference to the transportation of our troops in the war.

His final statement that "We escort only one-third of the merchant-vessels that come here" is also untrue. His report to which I have heretofore referred, on page 15, states that we provided 45 per cent of the ocean escort vessels for protecting allied shipping in the Atlantic. If Sims is willing to credit us with 45 per cent, it is safe to assume that we provided at least one-half of the escort for allied shipping.

While in London, in visiting the naval headquarters to secure information as to the departure of ships, we again met Admiral Sims. He courteously invited us to his office, and, evidently forgetting that he had delivered his lecture to us in Paris, he again proceeded to impress upon us the small part that our Navy played in the war, reciting the figures stated above, and which I have proved to be false. Not satisfied with telling us how small a part we played upon the sea in time of war, he proceeded to tell us that in time of peace we should seek to play no part at all. He expressed the hope that we would not be led astray by the agitation for a merchant marine. He declared that England, because of her geographical location, must necessarily control the seas, and that we could rely upon her at all times providing a merchant marine to transport our goods to foreign markets. When I took issue with him, he stated that, even if we entertained the view that it would be desirable for the United States to possess a merchant marine, it was impossible because we could not compete with Great Britain; that it would be necessary to pay subsidies, for which our people would never stand; and that it was the part of wisdom for us to develop the great West and leave the sea to Great Britain. With that Government, he said, we would never have any trouble, and Great Britain could be depended upon at all times to care for our business upon the seas. Though I believed at the time it was a waste of energy, I, nevertheless, told him that he was mistaken in his estimate of the American people. That our people had reached the conclusion that it was essential to the prosperity of America that we should possess a merchant marine; that if it was necessary to pay subsidies in order to have it, we were willing to do it. I think I was right. I believe the American people have made up their minds that the time will never again come when we will be dependent upon Great Britain or any nation for the transportation of our commodities to market. The American flag has reappeared upon the seas, and never with the consent of the American people will it leave the seas. [Applause.]

So impressed was I with the fact that this man is an incurable anglophile that upon my return I felt it my duty to report to one in authority the substance of what I have now stated. I felt it my duty to advise my Government that I would just as soon apply to the British Admiralty for an American view as I would to Sims. [Applause.]

In criticizing Sims for magnifying the achievements of the British Navy at the expense of the American Navy I do not criticize the Government of Great Britain. While abroad I met many officers of the English Army and Navy, and no one of them would have been guilty of slandering the United States Army and Navy as did Sims. No man could visit the battle field of Ypres and the Grand Fleet as I did, without being impressed with the magnificent part played by the army and navy of Great Britain in the war; and nothing that a hyphenated politician like Sims can say will either add to or detract from the glorious record of the sons of Great Britain. [Applause.] His efforts to flatter them by slandering the Army and Navy of America will meet with the contempt of every true Englishman as it does of every true American. [Applause.]

Our Navy needs no defense at my hands. The Secretary of the Navy needs no defense at my hands. Mr. Daniels is human and had mistakes been made by him in this great naval undertaking it would not have been surprising. However, the only mistake he made that I know of was his appointment of Sims. [Applause.] But the judgment of Daniels can not rest upon a single appointment. Let us not forget his other appointments: Benson, as Chief of Operations; Mayo, next in rank, as commander in chief of the United States Fleet; Wilson, in France; Gleaves, conveying our troops; Hugh Rodman, with the Grand Fleet; Niblack, in the Mediterranean; Strauss, Dunn, Andrews, and the others who served abroad. And then in the department: Palmer, Earle, Griffin, McGowan, Taylor, Parks, and Braisted. Unlike Sims, these men have no press agents. They ask only the opportunity to serve their country. But they

made the Navy a fighting force of which every American is proud. Josephus Daniels organized that force, and when the tocsin of war sounded it found the Navy under Daniels prepared for action. The breath of scandal has not touched his department, either in organization or demobilization. [Applause.] He sent into the war an efficient Navy; he sent into the war a sober Navy; and when peace came he returned to the mothers of America the boys they so freely gave to their country, as clean and as pure as when they left their homes. And while Sims is fighting the battle of the medals let me say to him that, under the direction of Josephus Daniels, the Navy in this war so conducted itself that the uniform of the American sailor is to-day the emblem of bravery and efficiency, in itself, a decoration of which every sailor boy is justly proud. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, as many Members know, I have given some thought to the general subject of a proper and adequate plan of national defense. I have dwelt with considerable emphasis upon the question of the importance of matériel. In many respects it is more difficult to produce than trained personnel.

Neither personnel, matériel, nor both together will avail a nation anything when the crisis comes if that fine, indescribable, intangible thing called the spirit of an army or of a nation be lacking or proves to be of inferior quality. It is of this I would speak to-day, of what threatens to destroy it in our Army and Navy and what may be done to prevent it.

My subject is humanizing the Army. I would not have it inferred that the Army is inhuman. It is not, although there are doubtless exceptions even to this rule. As a rule, Army officers are humane and kind-hearted. Even when this is not the case, where one is not kind-hearted and gentle, even he, in most cases, is careful of the comfort of his men, for if not so he is not an efficient officer.

I wish to speak, however, of the strictly human side of officers and men in their relations to each other in the service. Having been an officer myself, it will not be claimed that I speak in hostility to the officers. There can be no doubt that there has come out of the recent war, more than from any other war, a feeling of antipathy on the part of the enlisted men, amounting in many cases to resentment, against Army officers as a class, and in my judgment it is one of the most unfortunate and disturbing outgrowths of the war. The fact that it is in most cases undeserved and without foundation in reason does not make it any the less true or any the less unfortunate.

What is the cause? How much foundation is there for such a feeling? What will the consequences be if permitted to go unchecked? What can be done to counteract it? These are some of the questions which suggest themselves.

What has caused the growth of such a feeling in the recent war? Some have thought it to be an unconscious contagion from soldier and soviet government in far-off Russia. Some have thought it the result of Bolshevik propaganda. Some have thought it a revulsion against militarism, sometimes called Prussianism.

In my judgment none of these have exercised more than a very remote and indirect effect. If I have estimated the situation correctly, we need not go very far outside of the Army itself to account for the presence of such a sentiment during the war or its growth and spread since actual fighting ceased.

What I am now going to say does not apply to the better grade of Army officers, or to Army officers as a rule, but there are so many exceptions to the rule that I shall pass over the rule entirely and for the benefit of all devote myself for a while to the exceptions.

Caste in the Army has much to do with the problem of which I am speaking. Caste may be described as a thin veneer of dignity spread over a medium or soft piece of officer material to prevent a too easy detection of the true quality of the timber. [Applause.] Its true place is where there is a strictly militaristic governing class, as in Germany before the war. It was convenient in the small army of Great Britain, where long before the present war commissions were bought, in many instances, by the younger sons of titled families.

It was never entitled to a place or even consideration in America. Unfortunately it was taken up somewhat early by a few of the small circle of officers in our small Army. It even took root in the soil of West Point and has never ceased to grow in the rare and rarified atmosphere of that great institution. It is copied by many of those coming into the Army from civil life, for why should they permit the West Pointer to excel

in a lesson so easily mastered? Result: They often "out-Point the Pointers." For those coming up from the ranks it is next to impossible to escape the contagion, and as a rule they do not try.

The *raison d'être* usually given for this anomalous exotic which I have labeled caste in our Army is discipline. The theory is that if an enlisted man should once discover that an officer is just an ordinary human man like himself all discipline would cease. Therefore there must be nothing but official relationship between officers and men. I deny this theory. [Applause.] The trouble with the theory is that the enlisted man knows all the while just what the officer is. He knows that he is just the same kind of man as himself and that the assumed superiority is not real.

It has been contended seriously that in order to maintain discipline in our Army it is necessary that there be a hard and fast line of demarcation, socially and otherwise, drawn and maintained between officers and men. Speaking from such experience as I have had and much observation, I deny the proposition. On the contrary, in my judgment any attempt to do so is subversive of real discipline, the only kind that counts in a crisis. [Applause.]

Do not misunderstand me. The officer who attempts to play demagogue to his men by playing the weak-kneed good fellow or hall fellow well met and hopes thereby to retain their respect will utterly fail. He thereby proves himself not a leader of men but one fit only to be led. Even the hard-boiled upstart and would-be martinet is no worse than he. My own conception of an officer is best expressed by that affectionate Army pet name, "the old man." He should be a "daddy" to his men. True, he must be a just, firm, and somewhat Spartanlike father, but if he has not a heart large enough to go out to and include every man in his outfit, be it a company, a regiment, a division, or an army, then he is not a good officer. [Applause.]

The human element can not be eliminated. It ought not to be attempted. American soldiers can not be molded into inanimate cogs in a machine, though they can be developed into highly trained units of a great organization. The German military machine exemplified the former, while the latter describes my ideal of an American Army.

I have referred to the spirit of caste in the Army. I shall give only two instances, perhaps somewhat extreme, to illustrate what I have in mind.

When my own regiment was at the Mexican border in 1916 we marched overland a considerable distance to an Army post in order to use the rifle range. The regiment of colored Cavalry regularly stationed there was with Pershing in Mexico. Only a small number of enlisted men, as caretakers of the post, and a few white officers had been left. At the post exchange was a well-kept restaurant with two dining rooms, one for colored enlisted men and the other for white officers. A half dozen officers and as many enlisted men from my regiment went into the restaurant for dinner the day we arrived. All were seated in the dining room usually occupied by white officers. A few negro soldiers were eating in the other dining room. A first lieutenant of Regulars entered the officers' dining room, and seeing half a dozen enlisted men eating there immediately demanded that they be removed to the other dining room before he, the lieutenant, would condescend to take his seat. It happened that the enlisted men in question were from the company in which I had served as a private, and I knew them all very well. They happened to be Yale graduates and sons of some of our best families, although that is not important in this connection. I might add, incidentally, that five of the six became officers in the war against Germany and made fine records. This shows the type of enlisted men they were, but this made no difference to the snobbish lieutenant. He would not eat in the same dining room where a small group of enlisted men were quietly eating the first square meal they had encountered for a week. They might have joined their more gentlemanly colored comrades across the hall, and I am quite sure that it was no false caste spirit which prevented them from doing so; but, in fact, they left the exchange and returned to the more congenial beans and sowbelly of the company kitchen.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I was curious to know if the lieutenant had authority to do that?

Mr. TILSON. It was not a matter of authority. It was a private dining room conducted at the post exchange by a private individual.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What I am asking is, did he have the right to cause those privates to retire?

Mr. TILSON. He had a right to ask the proprietor to do so; and if the proprietor did not comply, I can imagine what would



have happened to the post-exchange restaurant if that officer had anything to do with it thereafter.

Mr. GALLIVAN. But the lieutenant could not issue an order?

Mr. TILSON. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is what I was getting at—as to whether he had authority. He simply could make it unpleasant for the people who operated the restaurant?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; but that would be sufficient.

The other case that I shall take the time to instance is one that shows that this pseudo-discipline is not only practiced but that it is boasted of and taught to others as worthy of emulation. This instance, I am informed by a reserve officer, was told by the hero himself, who was a Regular Army officer instructing in discipline at one of the training camps established at the start of the war for the instruction of new officers. This officer-instructor dilated at considerable length upon the necessity for drawing a strict caste line between officers and men, and told this story as an example of the extent to which this should be carried. He told the class of new officers that for nearly a year at one time in his military career he was stationed at a lonely post in the Philippines with but a single other white man, his sergeant, to keep him company, except at long intervals when he received or was able to pay visits to other posts in the vicinity. He stated that during that entire period he strictly maintained his dignity in all his dealings with the white sergeant, and that during all the time they were at the post together he did not exchange a single word with the sergeant except in the line of official business.

The officer who told this story is undoubtedly an exception to the general run of Regular Army officers, but in this particular case he was in a position to do much harm if the new officers under his instruction accepted his Prussian idea of what should be the relations between officers and men.

In the recent war many officers coming in from Plattsburg and other training camps came imbued with the same strange notion of what is necessary for discipline, and what they lacked in knowledge of the profession of arms many of them tried to make up by out-Heroding Herod in applying what they falsely supposed to be the real West Point idea.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TILSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. POUL. Does not the gentleman think that a good deal of this unfortunate feeling on the part of the enlisted men toward the officers arises from what I understand to be the modern method, namely, that instead of the important officers leading their men in action they send them forward while they themselves stay in a perfectly safe place? As I understand it, it is the modern method, in a major action, for all down to about the first lieutenant to remain in a comparatively safe situation while the enlisted men are sent forward.

Mr. TILSON. I do not think it can be explained so easily, and, besides, I do not understand that what the gentleman describes is in fact the modern method. Of course, in modern warfare, with the magnitude of the operations that are carried on, the higher officers who command much larger units than was formerly the case, are necessarily at the positions where they can most effectively command their organizations, which is often some distance from the front line. The officer whose duty it is to accompany a particular unit is with this unit, whether it is a platoon in the front trench or a company, a battalion, or a regiment a little farther back. In a modern battle it is impracticable for a general officer, for instance, to take up his post of command in the front-line trench. It would be well-nigh impossible for him to reach or communicate with the rest of his organization, and it would be next to impossible for him to direct the battle from such a position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask that the gentleman have half a minute more in order to answer a question.

Mr. TILSON. Can I have one minute more?

Mr. GOOD. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman please make it two minutes?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman says, and I have a complete contempt for the snobbishness he has referred to, and I know he has studied the subject.

Mr. TILSON. It has been a matter of some concern to me, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will not the gentleman in some way indicate what Congress might do to relieve this unbearable, undemocratic, and indecent condition?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know just what Congress can do about it. It would be extremely difficult to frame any law that could reach such a matter. As an individual Member of Congress, I was talking the other night with a dozen or 15 thoughtful Army officers at a small dinner, and I took that occasion to tell them that, in my judgment, it was necessary for such officers as they and others, who have the highest interests of the Army at heart, to take this matter in hand. I told them that, if necessary, they must lean over backwards in order to convince the fathers and mothers of this country that when these young men, their sons, go into the Army they will receive human treatment and recognition that men who are serving their country deserve.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Just one more question. We have pursued that policy of leaving it to the Army officers themselves for a century, and it has resulted in the condition the gentleman has described. Is it not time we looked somewhere else for a remedy?

Mr. TILSON. If we are to depend upon a professional army to fight future wars—a paid army of enlisted men—possibly the people of the country can afford to neglect this matter and let it go on as it has been going. If, however, we are to rely in case of war in the future upon a democratic army, an army where the individual soldiers are to come from all the families of the land and be truly representative of the people, I think it important that there should be a change in this regard. If we are to have universal military training or any other plan founded upon the universal obligation of the citizen to fight his country's battles in time of war, then it is essential that the human element be recognized. The fathers and mothers of the land must understand that difference in rank in the Army is only the measure of responsibility, and that, whether their sons serve as high-ranking officers or as private soldiers, they equally fulfill the duty of citizenship. Class distinctions have no place in a democratic Republic like ours, whether it be in military or civil life. Difference in rank and pay is necessary in the Army and the Navy for the proper distribution of duties and responsibilities. Leaders must be placed in the proper position from which to lead effectively, and they must have power, authority, and compensation accordingly. In civil life the same adjustment is made in a slightly different way, and with the same general result; but whether generals or privates, captains of industry or common laborers, all are equal before the law, all are equal before God, and there is not, and must not be, any place in America for classes, for class distinctions, or class spirit. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from Connecticut a minute more?

Mr. GOOD. All of the time has been assigned.

Mr. TILSON. The time is all apportioned. I thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, H. R. 5918 was reported favorably by the Committee on Military Affairs and is now pending in this House, and I trust that in due time it will receive your favorable consideration. It is a bill directing the Secretary of War to inquire into the feasibility of creating a national park down on the Plains of Chalmette, a little below the city of New Orleans, the plains on which was fought the memorable, the unforgettable, the celebrated Battle of New Orleans. The cost of making such a survey will be so small as to be almost negligible. But if the cost were a hundred thousand times greater than the small amount that will have to be expended in making this survey, in my judgment the sentiment of the American people and of history would justify such an outlay.

I do not intend, my friends, in the few remarks I shall endeavor to make as rapidly and felicitously and entertainingly as possible in the short time allowed me, to refer to the past with any bitterness, because I am not "anti" anything, but I shall refer to and dilate upon the great events that led up to this splendid battle, and particularly the battle itself, and the important results which flowed from it, with the pride of an American proud of the achievements of his countrymen on land and on sea and in the diplomatic councils of the world's affairs.

The Battle of New Orleans, in my judgment, will some day take its place among the important struggles in the world's history. When the celebrated work known as the Fifteen De-

cisive Battles of the World shall be revised in order to include the tremendous epoch-making engagements that have been fought in recent years, I feel confident, from the observations of competent military authorities, that the Battle of New Orleans will be included among the achievements that brought lasting results, results that practically changed the destiny of the race in our quarter of the globe.

The Battle of New Orleans was one of the greatest victories ever gained upon the Western Continent; and in order that we might thoroughly understand its importance to the history of the United States of America, in order that we might grasp the fullness of this magnificent achievement of American arms, let us reflect for a moment, Mr. Chairman, on what would have been the result had Gen. Jackson been defeated on the plains of Chalmette and as a consequence of that defeat the occupation of the Louisiana Territory by British armies, which was the purpose of the invasion. The United States of America would have been confined territorially to that space now lying between the Mississippi River and the Atlantic Ocean.

The Mexican War would never have been fought. The Civil War in all probability would not have been fought, and if it had been fought it would have terminated differently from the way it did terminate, and for the obvious historical reasons which will occur to you at once when you consider the fact that the country west of the Mississippi River would have been under the British flag. Texas would not be a part of this Union, nor would the Gadsden Purchase, nor Oregon. In fact, that vast territory which runs from the western bank of the Mississippi River clear over to the Pacific littoral would be another Canada. The war of 1898 with Spain would never have come to pass. As a consequence we would have had no territorial possessions in the Caribbean Sea and no insular possessions in the Pacific Ocean.

When one cogitates, when one thinks of the tremendous results which flowed from that battle, it is easy to be seen by any American that it takes its place among the great victories achieved by our arms, and in all probability it should rank with the great battles of the world's history which are regarded as decisive in settling some great current in human affairs—that established great republics or empires.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman let me finish? Then I will yield to any question.

Mr. PLATT. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is necessary, gentlemen, in order to thoroughly understand the tremendous events that led up to this battle, to turn back the hand of time and roll up the curtain upon the romantic past, under whose shadow we are still living.

Guided by history's pages, we see Narvaez going from Mexico to Florida and touching at the mouth of the Mississippi River. He was a Spanish conquistador, a nobleman and explorer. That was in 1528. Fourteen years later we see Hernando De Soto viewing the Mississippi River at some place near where the Arkansas joins her. He was a splendid Spanish conquistador, a striking figure in that romantic period, and was buried darkly at night, as was said of Sir John More, and left alone with his glory. But he had a magnificent tomb, and the tide of the Father of Waters rolling all the way to the Gulf of Mexico and on to the Atlantic Ocean probably furnished to him a funeral train such as was never the lot of any other man in history or romance. Out in the rotunda of the Capitol, under the dome, you will see eight great pictures portraying the life of America from the romantic and historical standpoint; one picture by William H. Powell portrays the wonder and amazement of De Soto and his followers when they beheld the Father of Waters gliding southward in its solemn, majestic sweep to the Mexican Sea. Years and years elapsed, and in 1673 we find Joliet and Marquette descending the Mississippi River, under the direction of the French governor of Canada, in search of the mighty river that was supposed to run from east to west and connect the two great oceans. Then they returned, having gone as far south as the Arkansas River.

Strange as it may appear, my fellow Members, the idea that a great river ran from east to west and connected the eastern and western oceans remained even among educated people for over a century after these great explorers had gone to that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler has ever returned, and I understand that in South America there is still a disposition to believe that there is such a waterway.

Only lately down in Panama it was thought that the Chagres River at one time did make a connection between the two great bodies of water. It is said that Balboa, when he viewed from the

hill that bears his name the mighty Pacific, looked for the river that he thought joined it to the Atlantic.

In 1682 La Salle completed the discovery of the Mississippi River and claimed the whole country for France, naming it Louisiana, in honor of Louis XIV.

It is clear to you gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole House from this recital that there must have been an issue between France and Spain in regard to the immense territory involved and flowing from the right of discovery. This is made clear by the fact that in 1762 France, by treaty of Fontainebleau, ceded to Spain all that part of the Louisiana territory lying west of the Mississippi River and the island of Orleans, which is today New Orleans, and in the following year, 1763, by the treaty of Paris, surrendered all of that part of the territory lying on the right bank, and Florida, to England. The desire of Napoleon to create a colonial empire in America led to the secret treaty of St. Ildefonso, in 1800, by which France acquired that part of Louisiana formerly ceded to Spain. This acquisition by the great Corsican and the treaty by which France secured it was denounced as fraudulent by Spain and England, and Napoleon transferred it to the United States for \$15,000,000, as he feared an invasion of the Louisiana territory by England and wished to make us its defenders. Matters drifted, as Napoleon was then at the zenith of his power and the terror of Europe. Then came that terrible day for him and joy for Europe whence he had to abdicate and fled to Elba, in the early summer of 1814.

England was now in control of the world. Up to this time she was successful in the War of 1812, her chief triumph being the capture and burning of our Capitol. London newspapers teemed with accounts of her easy victory and triumphs and ridiculed a people that could not offer a soldier's resistance to the invaders of their country. Our President and Army—in fact, the population—were mercilessly lampooned upon the stage and derided and sneered and scoffed at in the English journals of the time. Flushed with success on the Continent, England now determined to settle with the infant Republic and give her a military lesson that would break her spirit completely. Therefore one of the conditions to be imposed upon France was the return of Louisiana to Spain and which England would take from us if her ally should not be strong enough to do so for herself.

It was indeed a day of appalling danger for our country. The entire valley was to be trampled under military heel. An immensely large force for that time was to embark from Plymouth for the conquest of the Gulf States, the control of the Mississippi Valley, and the occupancy of the Louisiana Purchase. This army was composed of men who had been under Wellington in the Peninsular wars. Gen. Ross was to have commanded this invading army after Wellington declined its command; but Ross was killed on the banks of the Patapsco, and Sir Edward Pakenham was placed in charge, the Duke of Wellington having again declined the command.

It was a dark period for our country. The old martial spirit of the Revolution seemed to be dead. The war was far from arousing any patriotic enthusiasm. Even the school children of America were depressed, downhearted, and saddened at the overwhelming calamities that had befallen their country.

It is clear that if another disaster had befallen our arms instead of the triumph that we won, if another defeat had been our fate, we would have been crushed and overwhelmed by such a catastrophe, England would have occupied New Orleans and taken possession of the Louisiana Territory without another blow, as we would have been at her mercy.

We had sent James Bayard, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Jonathan Russell, and Albert Gallatin to secure a treaty of peace.

Lord Castlereagh about this time said: "Every port and city in America is in our hands and the Americans are little better than prisoners in their own land." The London Sun, as well as the Canadian newspapers, looked forward to and predicted the annihilation of what they scornfully refused to recognize as a military force.

Our peace commissioners were subject to mortification. Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Indiana were demanded as an evidence of our defeat. This was on September 8, 1814. It is needless to say that these demands were promptly refused by our commissioners.

Keep this fact in mind, my countrymen, for the seeming friend of to-day may be the enemy of to-morrow, and eternal vigilance and watchfulness are necessary to safeguard the interest and unity of the Nation. For on October 24, six weeks later, Lord Bathurst gave Pakenham his commission and orders to proceed to Plymouth and embark there for Louisiana to assume command of the forces operating for the reduction of that Province. All of these warlike preparations were being made while the peace conference was in session at Ghent.



Yes, my countrymen, eternal vigilance is the price, or a part of the price, we must pay to preserve our liberties, our freedom, our institutions. Self-reliance, preparedness, training, resolution, and fortitude should be the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night to guide us along the road to the goal of our country. Alliances, except for the purpose of trade, do not appeal to a bold and militant people. Courage and that discipline which comes as a result of training from the cradle until the patriot steps on the battle field or the deck of his country's war vessel are what make for a nation's perpetuation and its glory.

It is true a treaty of peace was signed, but let us not forget that it was not a spirit of generosity on the part of England that led to the abandonment of her extraordinary claims and proposed indemnities as an evidence of our humiliation, but because she was assured just at this time and believed that we were so torn and worn by dissension, so near exhaustion that dissolution was inevitable, and that the dismembered States would seek a new and closer alliance with her as separate and distinct dependencies. In other words, she hoped to secure more by what she considered the inevitable process of dissolution, that her informants thought they saw in operation, than by force of arms or a too exacting treaty and the harsh terms she had intended to impose. She had not relinquished her rights in the Louisiana Purchase on behalf of Spain, nor had she abandoned her plans to control the Mississippi, for the Pakenham expedition had been hurried across the Atlantic and assembled at Negril, Jamaica, with a full civil government for the Crown Province of Louisiana, as it was referred to by England; and no effort was made to recall it.

As a matter of fact all plans for the invasion and occupancy of the Louisiana Territory were being actively pushed while the peace conference was in session. Do not ever forget this, my countrymen; keep it in mind, lest on some tremendous day we have to pay for our carelessness in blood and tears.

Just at this critical time in the history of our country there loomed on its horizon one who became a great figure in the affairs of this world, one who came out of the woods, like Hosea of old. Tried by obscurity, poverty, pain, danger, and the malevolence that always assails merit, he had overcome disappointment, surmounted every obstacle, subdued and triumphed over every disaster. The perils of the wilderness, the hostility of the savage, the silent antagonism of the trackless swamps and the unbroken forest, melted into thin air before the dauntless courage and martial fire of this hero, warrior, statesman, patriot, and American, Andrew Jackson, whose fiery heart never quailed before any foe, whose crest was never lowered to any enemy.

His fame as an Indian fighter, his wonderful march against Pensacola, his defense of Fort Bower had reached Europe, and Wellington saw flashing across the military skies, not a meteor dazzling in its brightness for a moment, only to plunge into everlasting gloom and darkness, but a rising star of the first magnitude.

I will not dwell upon Pakenham's advance up the Gulf of Mexico and through Lake Borgne, nor upon the skirmish by lake and land, by river and bayou, that preceded the memorable conflict on the 8th of January, 1815. Expede Hercules. From the foot of Hercules build his statue. From this Spartan message vision the glory of our victory—the tragedy of their defeat.

American loss: 7 killed and 6 wounded.

English loss: 700 killed, 1,400 wounded, and 500 prisoners.

Among the slain was Pakenham, the gallant leader of the invading force. As are Leonidas and Thermopylae Pass to Greece are Jackson and New Orleans to Americans.

When shall the glory of our Army fade? Shall we of this great country ever forget the Kentuckians, Tennesseans, Mississippians, and Louisianians, some of whom marched 1,200 to 1,500 miles to be with Jackson and his immortal aids, Coffee and Carroll? Let the Jackson Highway of to-day, over which they marched when it was an unbroken wilderness from end to end, convey in eloquent silence the greatness, the glory, the grandeur of these splendid souls who are now in the great beyond, near the throne of God.

They are buried all over the South and West. After playing out in a magnificent way their parts as American citizens and soldiers, they joined the glorious souls who fought, struggled, bled, and died for the land since the first white man placed his heel upon it. Each of Jackson's soldiers was a York, born with a rifle near his hand, trained to meet danger from his infancy, and with lion-hearted courage had subdued his savage foes. The glory of the English Army went as chaff before the wind when they met our backwoodsmen rifle experts and dead shots. No enemy could hope to struggle successfully with such Ameri-

can invincibles. They are no more. They have passed away, but their blood is still here. They themselves are in the great country of all men's hopes, on the blue-tented field above.

The muffled drum's sad roll has beat  
The soldier's last tattoo;  
No more on life's parade shall meet  
That brave and daring few.  
On fame's eternal camping ground  
Their silent tents are spread  
And glory guards with solemn round  
The bivouac of the dead.

Their shivered swords are red with rust,  
Their plumed heads are bowed,  
Their haughty banner, trailed in dust,  
Is now their martial shroud;  
And plenteous funeral tears have washed  
The red stains from each brow,  
And their proud forms, in battle gashed,  
Are free from anguish now.

Rest on, embalmed and sainted dead,  
Dear as the blood you gave,  
No impious footsteps here shall tread  
The herbage of your grave;  
Nor shall your glory be forgot  
While fame her record keeps,  
O! honor points the hallowed spot  
Where valor proudly sleeps.

[Applause.]

May I, my countrymen, now that as a Louisianian I have placed metaphorically a wreath of my great State upon the last resting place on earth of the brave Kentuckians, never-to-be-forgotten Tennesseans, and immortal Mississippians, who won for themselves and their country on Chalmette Plains on January 8, 1815, fadeless crowns of glory—may I say a few words of our own Louisiana, the Niobe of States, and her beautiful and romantic daughter, New Orleans?

If you would feel glory's thrill, if you would feel the throb of an unwritten epic, read the story of Jean Lafitte, the pirate, who would not sell his country for all the bright gold England could offer; read the story of Dominick You, whose epitaph from Voltaire's "La Henriade"—

*Intrépide guerrier, sur la terre et sur l'onde,  
Il sut, dans cent combats, signaler sa valeur,  
Et ce nouveau Bayard, sans reproche et sans peur,  
Aurait pu sans trembler, voir s'écrouler le monde.*

The intrepid hero of a hundred battles on land and on sea, and who, like another Bayard, without fear and without reproach, will one day, unmoved, view the destruction of the world, claims the attention of all who visit his tomb—the attention of all passers-by in the old St. Louis cemetery, where are buried You, and by some it is said Lafitte, the kinsmen of Hernando De Soto, and these grand old Creole dames and gentlemen who loved the beautiful Queen City of the South—where lie the Louisianians who stood shoulder to shoulder and heel to heel and heart and soul to soul with their brethren from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi—if you would catch the atmosphere of this epic in our history, read the wonderful work issued by the Louisiana Historical Society in commemoration of the centenary of the Battle of New Orleans, on January 8, 1815, and which has an honored place in the great Congressional Library.

And never forget a tradition which our people boast of as an evidence of the heroism of their great men and women. If Jackson had lost the conflict on the plains of Chalmette, he had planned to retreat up the river with his army and the entire population of New Orleans, then set fire to the city, and when it was destroyed cut the banks of the river and inundate its smoking ruins, obliterate it, so that the enemy would have no resting place for the winter. My countrymen, even that thought conveys to our minds the man more clearly than any poem or oration the dauntless Americanism of this hero, Jackson, champion of liberty, son of freedom, and hero of New Orleans and his country's idol.

It is said that William of Orange was willing to take the people of Holland to the Asian islands in the Pacific below the Equator, and there under the Southern Cross, where the nutmeg and sugar cane grow, begin a new republic, but only after he would cut its dikes and flood the lowlands, in order that his country might not become the spoil of the invader and conqueror. Moscow stands out as another sublime story of resistance, and New Orleans is the great American epic, though unwritten, as to what the American people would do at all times to fight the invader. "Millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute" in its larger sense expresses our willingness to make any sacrifice the war god demands rather than prostrate ourselves before any foe. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, my song hath ended; my voice is about to join the echoes. Would that my address were worthier of the great event in our history.

But to other men and other times I leave the chapters that will in a measure reflect the glory that transcends in the minds of Americans—

The glory that was of Greece,  
The grandeur that was of Rome.

Down on those immortal plains, down on that glorious battle field, down where the bearded oak and the magnolia and pomegranate and orange and fig and the night jessamine grow, and the waters of the Mississippi sing on their way to the sea a mighty refrain under the moonlight to the brave spirits that fought the good fight and won, there rises a great shaft in memory of our gallant souls who repelled the invaders. It stands out under the sky of Chalmette, so that travelers to all parts of the world as they pass down the river to the Gulf may see it, and carry it in their hearts and affections—a monument to our sainted dead.

There on that holy ground, in the years to come as in those that have joined eternity, will be heard orations on the glory of their fall and their wonderful victory. Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi—Louisiana shall never forget your noble sons.

Our speakers shall always refer to them affectionately as the brave defenders of the valley.

And, in eulogizing your departed soldier, sons will point to that marble column that rises to the sky and declare:

Yon marble minstrel's voiceless tone  
In deathless songs shall tell,  
When many a vanquished age hath flown,  
The story how ye fell.  
Nor wrecks, nor change, nor winter's blight,  
Nor time's remorseless doom,  
Shall dim one ray of holy light  
That glids your glorious tomb.

[Great applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to take the attention of the committee from the splendid eloquence to which we have just been listening to sordid matters of business, but I want to call the attention of Members of this Congress and this committee to a fact that I have here. The department of unused and renovated war material from time to time, as well as other departments—and there seems to be several of them—sell material that is on hand. Sometimes in the sheets which they give out they attach the prices of the material that they are going to sell, and it is stated that they are the original prices of the articles. Most of the time no price is attached on these sheets. I call attention here to several hundred articles, but I wish to use the few minutes allotted to me to call the attention of Members to an official price list of articles for sale in the Army Quartermaster's retail stores, the list being No. 1, which was issued with prices of the materials attached thereto, as being the original price of the article. There are several hundred of them on this list, among which are some stocks and dies for iron pipe cutting and threading. Almost everyone knows what those articles are. This list shows stocks and dies, from a quarter of an inch to an inch, new, at \$23.50 a set; and offers to sell to the waiting public for that amount. Newspaper articles from time to time say that these sales are to be made for the purpose of permitting the returned soldiers to get the articles at reasonable prices—tools with which they may start in business, or through which they may secure employment and use the tools. I saw this price list, and saw upon it some stocks and dies, and I went to the stores and bought one set of new stocks and dies made by Armstrong Co., at Bridgeport, Conn.

The price listed is \$23.50, which is the price the Government paid, according to the package markings. This is the set of dies which I have here in this box. I then went down to Espey's hardware store on Pennsylvania Avenue, at No. 1010, and purchased identically the same set of stocks and dies, made by the same people, for \$7.25. Either the Government has been robbed to the extent of more than 200 per cent on all of its hardware articles, because this is a fair sample, or else the Government is profiteering to that extent. One or the other is true. Mr. Espey gave me a receipt for my purchase, and on the receipt he stated that he had never sold these articles before in the history of his business, and that is a good many years, for more than \$7.25. The Government purchased hundreds of different sets and of different sizes of stocks and dies, as well as all other kinds of hardware material, and I have here in my hand a great list of various articles that are offered for sale. I heard strong talk yesterday from the Democratic side, ridiculing the cry of economy and of economizing, but this shows that some one appointed by the Democratic administration sold to the Government at 200 per cent above ordinary price these articles, or else the Government, as I said before, is profiteering to that extent in selling them now to the public.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to inquire of the gentleman whether or not the sizes of these dies were different?

Mr. GARLAND. They are identically the same, and here they are in these two boxes. This box is a little different outside, because they have not been painting the boxes since the war, as they did before.

Mr. CONNALLY. Are they all of the same size?

Mr. GARLAND. The sizes are from one-quarter of an inch to an inch.

Mr. CONNALLY. And all the same size?

Mr. GARLAND. They are the same identically. Here is a piece of quarter-inch pipe where one end was thread cut with one set of dies and the other end with the other set of dies. They are identically the same; they are of the same make; there is not an iota of difference between them. The same company made them, and they are known as Armstrong No. 2 two-piece steel dies.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I think it would be very enlightening to the House and to the country if my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND] would make inquiry to ascertain whether or not the Government did allow itself to be robbed in that way by paying that high price or is in turn really profiteering on the public.

Mr. GARLAND. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that it is my intention to introduce to-day a resolution to have this matter referred to the committee on war-expenditures cost, the committee presided over by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM]. I intend to have all this data for the use of the committee, and I hope that the committee will make a thorough examination. I believe from the evidence that I have here that all of the hardware sold to the United States Government was sold at exorbitant prices, practically on the same ratio as this, of probably 200 per cent above retail prices. You can go into any town in the United States and buy that set of stocks and dies for \$7.25.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. One of these boxes contains the exact dies purchased by the Government?

Mr. GARLAND. One of them I purchased from the Government, and the other I purchased from Mr. Espey.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The Government originally had purchased the set, of course, which the gentleman purchased from it?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. So that the gentleman has the corpus delicti?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. The gentleman says that he purchased one from the Government and paid \$23.50 for the set?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes; the Government price.

Mr. CONNALLY. And the other from a retail dealer here, and paid \$7.25 for the set?

Mr. GARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. What object did the gentleman have in paying \$23.50 for one set, when he could have gotten it from a retailer at \$7.25?

Mr. GARLAND. The object is to show that somebody appointed by this Democratic administration apparently has been in the habit of selling to the Government hardware material at about 200 per cent above the retail cost price. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GARLAND was granted leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, when the Secretary of the Treasury suggested to us some time ago that the deficit at the end of the current fiscal year would be something over two and a half billions of dollars I think he did not have in mind that the deficiency estimates were going to pour in the way they have been coming. We have before us a bill carrying \$88,000,000, I believe, reduced by \$29,000,000 below the amount of the estimates, for expenditures that I doubt if the Secretary had in mind when he estimated the probable deficit at the end of the fiscal year. I think that to-day we will have to chalk down another sum of nearly \$90,000,000 as an increase of the war overhang at the end of the present fiscal year. It is facts like these that compel the continued discussion of economy.

Why, I understand that certain gentlemen are insistent that this bill, large as it is, shall be increased by about \$10,000,000



for the purpose, as I understand it—and a laudable purpose in a way and from one standpoint—of keeping certain people employed on Government work. In other words, locally and in administration circles generally there is a plan and purpose to continue public expenditures indefinitely along the same lines and in the same volume that they were carried on during the war. In these days, when we are hearing from innumerable sources of the alleged inadequate salaries and wages that the Federal Government is paying, there is nothing so painful, apparently, as the separation of one of these inadequately compensated people from the public crib.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Last year it was thought that four and a half billions would take care of the expenditures of this year because of an overhang from the war. Now we have the suggestion that next year it will be four and a half billions, and that means we are to have a permanent outlay of four and a half times what we had before the war?

Mr. MONDELL. It means we are to have that much of an outlay and a billion or two more unless this Congress takes the position that the American people will not stand it. [Applause.]

I am not privileged to mention what was said at a conference held this morning in the Speaker's room with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury—the Secretary being unable to be present, as he was in attendance on his last Cabinet meeting—and the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, there being present besides the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, the chairman, and the ranking member of the minority, of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the members of the steering committee—I am not privileged to say what those gentlemen said to us. They emphasized certain facts, patent to all, who study the financial condition of the country in a way to make them very clear. The problem of financing the war did not end with the signing of the armistice nor were all our problems met during the war, when in the spirit of patriotic enthusiasm anything could be accomplished. We have had trying problems since the close of the war. We are still confronted with them when, with the outside world, the European part of it, on the verge of bankruptcy, we are trying to take up the war overhang, reduce the tremendous war expenditures, and save the financiers of the country in these days of peace from the financial disaster that, thanks to the patriotism of the country, did not seriously threaten during the period of the war.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. It is the easiest thing in the world—

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment.

It will be the easiest thing in the world for this Congress to respond to demands made upon it here and there and elsewhere for appropriations and bond issues that would bring the Treasury of the country perilously near a condition of insolvency, and in doing that to send into political oblivion the men and the party responsible for it.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman intend to enlighten us as to the additional item to be added to this bill costing \$10,000,000?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it has to do with navy yards and repairs to ships in navy yards. But the gentleman will be fully enlightened; at least, he will hear much in regard to it, I presume, when the item is reached.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will not permit a rule to come in making it in order, I will save him any trouble about it, because I am going to make a point of order against it.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is referring to the construction and repair in 1920 of the war vessels of the United States in the \$10,000,000 item?

Mr. MONDELL. I understand it has to do with the repair of naval vessels. I am not discussing it. I do not pretend to be informed in detail in regard to it. I simply referred to it as one of the additional demands.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to say to the gentleman—

Mr. MONDELL. I have no time to discuss the merits of the item, and I am not doing it. It will be discussed. It doubtless has some merit, or otherwise no one, I trust, would be for it. The question is whether it is essential and whether the welfare of the people demands that we shall do it now.

He who preaches economy has the approval of everyone, but he who attempts to put economy into effect is likely to be very unpopular. In my reiterated insistence upon the practice of

economy in Government expenditures I find that I have the support, in principle, of almost everybody, but in endeavoring to apply the principles of economy to the specific propositions presented to Congress I have the unpleasant experience of encountering one after another the opposition of those who are favorable to the particular expenditure on which we are attempting to economize.

Notwithstanding all this, our duty is perfectly plain. With nine billions of estimated obligation and expenditure and six billions of estimated revenue, and with the probability that the obligations and expenditures have been underestimated and the income overestimated, whatever else we would like to do, there is only one thing that we can do, and that is economize.

May I be allowed to again emphasize the fact that in reporting our appropriation bills we must reduce the estimates as they appear in the Book of Estimates at least a billion or a billion and a quarter dollars. With this reduction we shall not escape serious consequences if, over and above and beyond the estimates totaling nine billions, we shall make vast expenditures.

A special effort is being made to pledge the country to a system of universal compulsory military training. I am not proposing at this time to discuss the merits of such a system. It is my duty to subject it to the analysis of cost. If the American people now, or at any time in the future, want such a system, that is for them to determine; but no man in a position of responsibility at this time is performing his duty to his country who does not frankly acknowledge the cost of any program he proposes, and no man responsible in any way for expenditures is performing his duty who does not correct misstatements which are made as to the cost of programs proposed.

I have been very much surprised to hear, from sources that ought to be well informed, the very extraordinary statement that a system of universal, compulsory, military training can be put in operation in the United States for \$125,000,000. The man or the organization that makes such a statement as that is either lamentably ignorant or willfully misstates the fact, and the computation of the cost of such a system is so simple that there is no excuse for a misstatement of the facts.

The fact is that a system of universal, compulsory military training could not be inaugurated in America and operated for the first year for less than \$1,000,000,000, and could not be carried on thereafter for less than \$700,000,000 per annum, and these figures are conservative and based upon facts so well known that the least-informed citizen may readily grasp them.

A system that would call for the training of all of the able-bodied, physically fit youth of the country of a given age—be it 18, 19, or 20, or whatever age selected—would apply to at least 800,000 men. That would be about the number after all the physically unfit had been excused. If 25 per cent, or 1 man in 4, of these physically fit youths were excused for one reason or another, it would still leave 600,000 men for training.

Under most of the plans proposed the actual training period would be four months. Adding to this 30 days in which to call, assemble, and transport the men to be trained to the training camps, and another 30 days as the least time in which they could be disbanded and transported to their homes, we have a period of six months during which upward of 600,000 men would be clothed, fed, cared for, transported, and trained at the expense of the Federal Government.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MONDELL. Very briefly.

Mr. OLNEY. You do not really believe that it would take 30 days before and after training to organize and to dismember these camps?

Mr. MONDELL. I do. The gentleman lives in a very small State. You can travel across it in a very brief time. But this is a very large country. [Applause.] By the time you took a man from a mountain village in Wyoming, or even a village in northern Maine, or from a seacoast town on the western or southern coast and assembled him with his neighbors at some central point, and transported them to the proper place of training, and organized them for training, all of 30 days would have been consumed. But let us not spend time over trifling details. It is the question of what it will cost that I am talking about. [Applause.] It might be only 29 days, but the difference in the cost would be infinitesimal.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, just for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman said it was a question of what it will cost. Am I to understand that everything from now on is to be measured in this House from the standpoint of what it will cost, or will it be measured from the standpoint of

what will be the merit and advantage to the American people? [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can argue this universal military training proposition as long as he wants to from the standpoint of advantage, but my purpose just now is to challenge attention to what it will cost. Evidently the gentleman does not want the people to know what it will cost, for fear if they knew what it would cost they might not want to embark on it at this time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. No; I can not yield further. I am discussing what it will cost just now, and I shall be glad to discuss other phases of it with the gentleman from Maryland at some other time. Let us count the cost, because there have been more misstatements made about the cost of this thing than about anything that I know of, men who ought to know better, members of organizations that ought to be informed, have been trying to hoodwink the American people into believing that for a mere pittance, for a few million dollars, you can transport the able-bodied young men of this country, 600,000 or 700,000 or 800,000 of them, and put them into camp and train them for several months for a measly sum of money.

If it is a good thing—and I am not arguing that point—if it is a good thing, let us have it, but let us know what it is going to cost. [Applause.] Let us know about it in these days when we are warned as to the condition of the Treasury. If the deficit is to be increased, let us know how much and inquire where the money is to come from? If gentlemen in advocating these plans will propose a tax on the American people that will meet the cost, whatever it is, then they will at least be making their plea from a sound financial basis. But when gentlemen proceed on the theory that it is not going to cost much of anything and that what little it does cost you can pick off the bushes, why, men who have a sense of responsibility have reason to protest.

The present cost per man of the Military Establishment of the United States averages approximately \$2,000 per annum. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that it would cost no more per man for the men in training than for the men in the Regular Military Establishment and the minimum cost for the minimum number of men which a universal training system would involve, with the exceedingly liberal provision of 25 per cent of the able-bodied men excused, would be, for 600,000 men, \$600,000,000. If fewer men were excused, the cost would be more. Every item of the cost of men in training, with the possible exception of the item of pay, would be higher than the corresponding cost of a man in the Regular Establishment. That would be due to the fact that, in the first instance, there would be the cost of assembling, a cost that does not occur in the Regular Establishment; the cost of transportation to and from the training grounds and from one training ground to another as the men were given a variety of training, greatly in excess of the average cost of transportation in the Regular Establishment.

The clothing cost would exceed an average six months' cost for the Regular Establishment, because the men would have to be fully equipped at the outset, furnished with a variety of training uniforms, and unquestionably they would be given a practically new outfit on their return home. The troops in training would have to be at least as well fed and housed and cared for as the men of the Regular Establishment. As a matter of fact, these items would all of them be higher than the average cost for the same purposes in the Regular Establishment.

In order to prevent epidemics among large bodies of young men suddenly brought together from homes all over the country it would be necessary to have extraordinary medical and hospital facilities. This and the cost of the maintenance of barracks and quarters, instead of being spread over a period of a year, would be concentrated in the training period of six months.

In the matter of officers it would take quite as many, and in all probability many more, in proportion to the number of men than would be required for regular troops, for the entire period would be one of travel, organization, intensive training—physical, military, educational; a period of intense activity. There would be the cost of recreation facilities and instruction, an item larger than for the same number of men in the Regular Establishment.

Army officers have testified that it would cost at least \$300,000,000 to put the camps of the country in condition for a system of universal military training, and that it would cost at least \$60,000,000 per annum to keep these camps in condition. The items, therefore, of a system of universal compulsory military training, with 25 per cent of the able-bodied men excused, would be for the first year as follows:

Enlargement, improvement, and extension of camps.....	\$300,000,000
Assembling, transportation, equipment, and training of 600,000 men.....	600,000,000
Maintenance camps, one year.....	60,000,000
Incidental costs, training, equipment, and material.....	40,000,000
Total.....	1,000,000,000

This sum might be reduced after the first year by the \$300,000,000 used for enlargement of camps, though the probability is that other unanticipated costs would take it up.

It is true that the proponents of this plan do not anticipate putting it in operation until the year 1921, but if put in operation in the spring of 1921 more than half of the cost for the first year would have to be borne out of the revenues of the year for which we are now appropriating. If such a system was to be put in operation in 1921 the work on the camps should begin at once, and at least \$600,000,000 of the first year's cost of \$1,000,000,000 would have to be met out of the revenues for the fiscal year for which we are now making our calculations.

Let it be remembered that the nine billions of estimated expenditures, to which I have referred, does not contain a penny for any of this class of expenditure; that it would be in addition to all the estimates heretofore made; and that therefore it would increase by the amount of its cost the deficit for the next fiscal year, now estimated at \$3,000,000,000. That estimated deficit, even as things now stand, is a real menace. It would be disastrous to increase it. If we are to have any more large expenditures, gentlemen proposing them should bring along with their proposal a plan of additional taxes to pay the cost. That is the only safe way, and if this system must be put into effect additional taxes should be levied to provide for it.

The fact is that this whole question of training should be left for settlement next year. We have over 4,000,000 trained men now. We are passing through the most trying financial period of the war, though the armistice was signed considerably more than a year ago. We are entering upon the financial period that is going to determine whether or no, having piled up a national debt of \$26,000,000,000, having an unbonded overhang of \$3,000,000,000, we are to pursue a policy which will bring us safely through the period of war financing, or a policy under which, a year and a half after the war is over, we are to be engulfed in financial difficulties which we happily escaped during the period of conflict.

I have discussed this from the standpoint of economy. Gentlemen may argue it from other standpoints as they desire. The first essential fact is how much it is going to cost; for if we have not the money we can not undertake it, be it ever so desirable. We can console ourselves with the fact that we have 4,000,000 splendidly trained young men in the country, and, thank God, there is no present menace to the Republic. [Applause.] And furthermore, camps and cantonments can be built or enlarged another year as well or better than they can this. Let us take plenty of time to think about this matter, to talk about it, and determine upon it. We can not well begin to do that until we have corrected the errors of the professional liars who go about the country trying to make the American people believe that you can have an enormous institution of this kind for the sum of money that would buy a child's box of toy tin soldiers. [Applause.]

There are many plans of training, some of which might meet the approval of all the American people. I am talking of the universal compulsory plan that is now proposed, and it is my duty to call attention to what it will cost. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, because of the ignorance or negligence, or because of the willful disregard of the laws of the United States by Carter Glass, the Secretary of the Treasury, or Rupert Blue, Surgeon General of the United States, sick and wounded American soldiers of the war with Germany are to-day not receiving treatment guaranteed them by the law, or are receiving treatment that can not be justified by anyone who has any regard for the well-being of the men who fought to maintain the country.

In Chicago, on January 15 last, American soldiers who had been seriously wounded, who had been and ought to be receiving treatment for their wounds, were requested to leave the hospital and discontinue treatment, in order that other men in more serious conditions might take their beds in the hospital.

In other words, after having volunteered to fight the war against Germany and having been seriously wounded, they were again, on January 15 last, at the Marine Hospital and the South Side Hospital in Chicago, asked to volunteer to leave those



hospitals and discontinue the treatments which are necessary for them.

In the hospitals in Chicago at the same time—and I believe in other hospitals in the United States—men who were wounded and ill by reason of their hardships in France are placed in crowded quarters, with insufficient air capacity. Wounded and sick men in these same hospitals are compelled to do what little vocational work they are able to do in bathrooms.

In these same hospitals men who have been gassed are quartered in dark hallways where no ray of sunlight has been or ever will be permitted to enter, and this in spite of the fact that since March 3, 1919, \$9,500,000 of money have been available and could and should have been used.

If this condition is permitted to exist for a few months more there will be thousands of wounded and sick American soldiers who need treatment and will be unable to secure it. In my opinion thousands of them will die, and the persons responsible for those deaths will be the men I have mentioned, or some of them, because Congress has performed its duty in appropriating the necessary funds, while they have not performed theirs in expending them.

All this in spite of the direct promise of this Government when, in section 302, paragraph 3, chapter 105, Fortieth Statutes at Large, page 406, in the war-risk act, it was stated:

In addition to the compensation above provided, the injured person shall be furnished by the United States such reasonable governmental medical, surgical, and hospital services and with such supplies, including artificial limbs, trusses, and similar appliances, as the director may determine to be useful and reasonably necessary.

This solemn promise was made by the American Government at the time these boys volunteered for service, and the fact that the promise has been broken and violated is the darkest blot upon this administration and the men responsible for the execution of the laws of the United States.

There can not be any valid reason for this neglect of the soldiers of our Army, and if the conditions continue to exist in spite of the laws of the country, of the publicity given to the facts, it will be necessary for some Member of Congress to try to secure action through the one remedy that is left, which is impeachment.

I doubt if there is a Member of Congress who could have believed, up to the present time, that public officials, charged with the duty of taking care of these wounded soldiers, would be so negligent of their duties as the facts show that they are and have been. I know that I would not have deemed it possible, and in the beginning learned of the facts largely through accident.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman speaks of their having sufficient money. I was of that opinion also until I read this bill and saw a deficiency appropriation of half a million dollars carried for this particular work. I was wondering why it was necessary to carry a deficiency appropriation if they have the money already.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is because of the fact that we appropriated for the Speedway Hospital in Chicago and instructed the Secretary of the Treasury to take it over, which would give 2,500 beds. Instead of complying with that mandatory act of Congress they maneuvered around with the plans month after month and then requested, as I remember it, about 26 additional buildings for which they desired an appropriation before they spend the money that we have already appropriated. I trust I have made it clear. If not, I will make it clear later.

Mr. GARNER. Then the gentleman's criticism is based upon the so-called Chicago hospital transaction?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Absolutely not. We appropriated \$9,500,000 on March 3, 1919, for additional beds for wounded soldiers, and not one additional bed has ever been put in since that date, and that money has not been expended and is lying there and could be expended.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the condition is such as the gentleman describes, can the gentleman state why his party, constituting as they do a majority of the Committee on Appropriations, have actually cut the estimates in this deficiency bill of \$1,000,000 for hospital construction down to \$500,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I can not answer that question, because I am not familiar with this bill; but it may be because of the fact that the Surgeon General has asked for an appropriation of \$85,000,000 for additional hospital facilities which he said were not necessary on June 24 last, and because

of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury in submitting the request of the Surgeon General said he could not tell whether the money was necessary or not. In other words, the Surgeon General under the Treasury Department asked for a certain sum of money. Then the Secretary of the Treasury says he has no method of determining whether or not the Surgeon General states the fact correctly.

On December 7, 1919, at the request of Hon. Peter W. Dougherty, former Assistant Attorney General, and railroad commissioner of the State of South Dakota, I went to an Army hospital at Fort Sheridan to see his son, expecting to find happy, contented, and well-treated men, with the small proportion of malcontented and objectors that are found in every unit of every army, regardless of the treatment the men receive. But on that trip to Fort Sheridan on that day I saw 60 men who were not fed and many others who could not secure sufficient food, and at that time I wired the Secretary of War as follows:

At General Hospital 28, Fort Sheridan, to-day I personally saw many men who could not secure any dinner and number of patients who had very short rations. At least 60 men were not fed. These are all wounded men who have seen active service in France and need the best of food and must receive it. I request that the Inspector General conduct an investigation to determine who is responsible for this condition and see that whoever is responsible be punished. Any of the enlisted men there can furnish the testimony.

The Secretary of War did send an inspector general to this hospital to investigate from December 11 to December 16, 1919, and that Army officer made a report from which I shall quote, and I quote from it not only to prove my statements but to prove them by the department itself.

Personally, I have been extremely careful in making charges against men connected with the departments, because it is extremely easy to take the floor of the House and to make extravagant charges against men who can not reply. And in making a complaint I have tried to submit names, dates, and facts, so that verification would be easy.

In reference to this complaint, Col. R. G. Peck, of the Inspector General's Department, reported, in part, as follows:

The dinner service commenced at 11.30 a. m. About 12 o'clock some 30 to 50 patients in the north mess hall were unable to get any meat, as the supply had become exhausted. There is no evidence to indicate that more than six of these men reported the matter to the mess officer or noncommissioned officer in charge of the mess hall. The latter, when he observed some disturbance among the patients and found that it was due to the fact that there was no more meat available, failed to assure the soldiers that if they remained quiet and seated he would see to it that they were provided with ample meat. Instead of giving them this assurance, he went to the kitchen for the purpose of ascertaining the cause for the exhaustion of the meat supply. During this time some of the patients left the mess hall. Eight of them returned to their wards and reported the incident to Lieut. Col. C. W. Havercamp, Medical Corps, who immediately got into communication with the mess officer, who arranged for these men to return to the mess hall and have a substitute meat served to them. This was done, and the men reported to Lieut. Col. Havercamp that they had been satisfied. All men who waited in the mess hall or who returned to the mess hall were served from one to three steaks each in about 15 minutes after the mess officer and mess sergeant had been informed that the pork chops had run out.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KREIDER. I wish to suggest that there is no lack of hospitals in the Army; there never has been a time when one-half of the Army hospitals have been filled or the beds occupied. The trouble is a fight between the War Department and the Treasury Department, under whose auspices the Public Health Service is supposed to operate. It refuses to accept hospitals and materials offered by the War Department.

In spite of the millions that have been spent, there are Army hospitals where the sun does not shine, and it is due to the antagonistic feeling that exists between the departments in the present administration. A better hospital, a more sanitary one, never has been built, a hospital that has been passed upon by the War Department, by the architects, and by the physicians; and yet the soldiers are obliged to go without treatment because some bulletheaded official refuses to accept the idea of a common, ordinary, sensible being to equip the hospital.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That matter I will come to a little later.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Surely the gentleman from South Dakota has not forgotten the fact that the President of the United States was forced to veto a bill and send it back to this House because he said that we had not given sufficient money to do the very thing which the gentleman from South Dakota now complains of. The gentleman will remember that this side of the House tried to add \$4,000,000 to the bill, and the gentleman's

side of the House defeated us each time, as the record will show.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. If I remember correctly, the gentleman is mistaken; that was for vocational training.

Mr. BLANTON. It was for the rehabilitation of the soldiers of the land.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It was not for hospitals.

The officer of the day, Capt. Charles O. Latham, Medical Corps, while making his prescribed inspection of the mess, discovered that the meat component had become exhausted, and took no action other than to bring the matter to the attention of the commanding officer the following morning in a written report covering his tour of duty. He made no inquiries as to whether more meat was to be served and did not report the incident to the mess authorities. Capt. Latham heard the men pound on the table with their dishes and call for more meat, but he did not consider it of sufficient importance to take any action other than that above mentioned. He stated that there was plenty of other food, and that it was unnecessary for anyone to leave the mess hall hungry. The mess sergeant stated that as soon as he was informed of the shortage he ordered 100 pounds of beefsteak to be prepared. He then went to the mess hall and informed the men who had not received meat to remain quiet and seated and assured them they would receive all the meat they wished. He also went through the corridors and announced to the men whom he found there that if any of them failed to receive meat they should go to the mess hall where ample would be served.

In addition to this report the colonel arrived at the following conclusions and submitted them to the Secretary of War:

The inspector found a number of unsatisfactory conditions at General Hospital No. 28, with particular reference to the condition of enamel ware in use in the mess and to the uncleanly and untidy condition of the kitchens and mess halls. He also received complaints bearing upon unsatisfactory food conditions at the hospital. Not only were such complaints received from enlisted men but from nurses as well. In fact, the complaints of the latter were the strongest, the principal one being that the food is cold when served. A list of all of these irregularities and deficiencies was furnished by the inspector to the commanding officer of the hospital.

And from those conclusions he made the following recommendations:

It also appears that, while the officer of the day is required to inspect all meals and eat at least one each day with the patients, this duty has been, in many instances, but perfunctorily performed, if at all. The inspector found that the temporary officers assigned to General Hospital No. 28 are practically worthless, as far as administration is concerned. They are not interested in their work and have been disciplined from time to time. The failure of the officer of the day to take immediate and proper corrective measures on Sunday, December 7, is typical of a lack of judgment, intelligence, and initiative in the matter of insuring proper conditions in the mess.

I shall not attempt to dispute any part of the Inspector General's report, because he admits the truth of the complaint, and has, in my opinion, attempted to remedy the situation. But when I can find, on a casual visit, that a condition of this kind could exist in an Army hospital, and men who testify it was of common occurrence, there is something wrong.

Since that time I have gone through other Army hospitals with a photographer, and I make the statements made at the beginning of these remarks, with the photographs and evidence to prove them.

The photograph, which I have marked No. 1, is a photograph of a little 10-foot square bathroom at a Marine hospital at 4133 Clarendon Avenue, Chicago, which is the only place that the patients there can have to make baskets or lamps or do the other work that men want to do to keep time from hanging too heavily on their hands. In that bathroom 10 men are supposed to work, and it would be crowded if 3 men were there at one time. The men in this picture are James E. Blackstone, of the *Black Watch*, British, sent there by the British consul, and Charles Haas, who saw service at Camp Gordon, and who resides at 153 Institute Place, Chicago.

It is an outrage that the 150 men in this hospital are, because of the neglect of the high officials of this Government, not given a place and opportunity to do what little work they can and want to do.

Picture No. 2 is a dark hallway in the officers' quarters in the Marine Hospital, and in the bed is Harry Flemming, Company D, One hundred and twenty-ninth Infantry, of the Thirtieth Division, who resides at No. 30 South Lincoln Street, Aurora, Ill., in the district of Representative Copley. Harry Flemming, this soldier, was gassed in the Argonne, and so badly gassed that he needs treatment to-day, more than a year after the armistice. The presumption is always raised in the minds of every doctor and of every man who saw gas or its effects that a man's lungs are affected, and it is an outrage that, because of the negligence or hard-heartedness of the high officials of the Government service that I have named, that this boy is compelled to lie there

day after day and hour after hour in this hallway, where no ray of sunlight ever has or ever will be permitted to enter, with the continual hurly-burly of a hospital hall to keep him awake or disturb him.

And I think Harry Flemming was taking his medicine like a good soldier, without complaint, perhaps not realizing that he was entitled to better treatment than that which he was receiving, and perhaps believing that the treatment meted out to him in France as an enlisted man is a criterion of what would be given him in this country as a civilian.

I wish that Newton D. Baker or Carter Glass or Rupert Blue, or the one of them that is responsible for the fact that not one dollar of the appropriation that we have made has been expended since March 3, 1919, for new hospital buildings, or who is responsible for the fact that not one single bed has been added to our hospital facilities since that appropriation has been made, would justify the placing of this gassed boy in this hallway or would justify the fact that the money we have appropriated has not been expended.

I should like to have one of them, or whichever one is responsible, say that the deaths that will come from this treatment will not be directly chargeable to the men who do not expend the money.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman does not mean to say that a dollar has not been spent on these hospitals?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Not for new hospitals.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman is mistaken. The records of the Public Health Service will show that the gentleman is not correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. The hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds show that the Speedway Hospital could have been completed in 60 days, furnishing 2,000 beds, but not a single thing has been done to forward the work for over six months, and a special statute had to be enacted in order to stir them up.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. So far as the special statute declared, \$3,000,000 should be spent on the condition that the contractor would accept the contract and specifications, but to-day the contractor is refusing to sign the agreement to complete the contract for \$3,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield further.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I challenge that statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In picture No. 3 is Frank Hoppe, of 1003 North Lincoln Street, Chicago. This picture shows four beds in another dark hallway in the Marine Hospital in Chicago. Every patient, every doctor, every nurse that walks back and forth from one part of this hospital to the other must pass directly by the four beds. The other three men are able to walk around and get a little fresh air, but although I was there in the middle of the day I know that the only light that Frank Hoppe receives he gets from the electric light, which is directly over his head. And if that is any way to take care of a patient in any hospital in the world I do not know it.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In regard to this picture of the dark hallway, it does not show that it was taken by any flashlight, so it seems that the dark hallway was light enough to have the photograph taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. The gentleman is mistaken; it was taken by a flashlight. I was standing there when the picture was taken. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. It does not show in the picture.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will tell the gentleman and that will settle it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman from Texas expect that the picture would show the flashlight itself?

Mr. BLANTON. Usually they do. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Picture No. 4 shows ward C of the Marine Hospital aforesaid, and is a good ward as wards go, except for the fact that it is overcrowded and the men there do not receive the air they need; but taking picture No. 5 in connection with No. 4, you will find a situation that every red-blooded man in the United States would resent, because No. 5 shows a small alcove running out of No. 4, where venereal men suffering from loathsome diseases are kept in immediate proximity to men who have been wounded and are ill.

Again, this little alcove with only three beds in it was, at the time I was in Chicago, the only place in that hospital that



had been set aside for influenza patients—a flood of which were expected—and it was taken away from them and turned over to these men suffering from infectious diseases.

The hospital numbers of the men to whom I refer are 10009, 11040, and 12165. I do not care to state their names.

Since the day I was there they have had 70 influenza cases in this hospital with three deaths, and there is absolutely no way to segregate those patients who were suffering from influenza.

The mixing of these two classes of patients may be justified by Cabinet officers, but I think they would resent it if one of their sons were compelled to live in the same ward with anyone suffering from any disease of this kind.

Picture No. 6 shows ward No. 505 at Public Health Hospital No. 2, at 4659 Drexel Boulevard, Chicago. This ward has a capacity of 9 beds, but at the present time there are 20 beds with 20 patients in this small space. At the present time in that hospital there are over 100 beds more than regulations provide for, and unless some provision is made at once there will be thousands of boys in that section of the United States who can not receive any treatment.

No. 7 is a typical ward at this hospital. It has a capacity of 70 patients and 80 or 85 beds. The men with wheel chairs, who are living in that ward, can hardly make their way up and down the corridors between the beds. None of them are objecting to the treatment, because they happen to be in a hospital that is as well conducted, I think, as any hospital in the United States, and by as good a man as there is in the United States. And they know that fact and do not make complaint.

When I found these terrible conditions existing I commenced to make inquiry as to why the money Congress appropriated on March 3, 1919, was not expended, and there seems to be no valid reason.

In Public, No. 326, of the Sixty-fifth Congress, on page 2, I find that the Secretary of the Treasury was instructed to take over a hospital which was being built in Chicago, known as the Broad View Hospital; that the Secretary failed to comply with this law; and that in July, 1919, he was instructed to acquire it; and on December 24, 1919, again instructed to acquire it. I find that the Surgeon General a few months ago—to be exact, the 24th of June, 1919—stated that the Broad View Hospital was too large for hospital purposes. And yet on December 17 of last year he comes before the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee and asks for \$85,000,000. Personally I should be in favor of giving him twice \$85,000,000 if it was necessary, but when you find that on March 3, 1919, we gave him \$9,500,000, none of which has apparently been expended, it seems it is useless to appropriate money.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. With reference to this Broad View Hospital, does the gentleman know that right now the Bureau of Public Health Service is refusing to go ahead with this proposition in Chicago, and that the Secretary of the Treasury is refusing to go ahead with the proposition, and that they are dillydallying for the purpose of getting rooms for attendants and nurses and doctors, instead of getting rooms for soldiers?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that not only am I familiar with that, but at the present time the commandant of the two hospitals in Chicago has been requested to make a report upon the advisability of expending \$800,000 for an old hotel building, which is shown in this picture, with the idea of making that a hospital—the most absurd thing that has ever been conceived by any public official.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I know that the gentleman would not want to misstate the facts. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] who just spoke, when the Speedway Hospital matter was up, told me in reply to my question that he would never ask for an appropriation of an additional dollar for that hospital.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And he is not asking for it, but simply asking that—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I refuse to be interrupted by the gentleman—and the fact is that the Secretary of the Treasury is writing a letter to Congress advising the Congress that while that law directed him to sign the contract with the Shank Co. for an expenditure for the construction of this hospital not to exceed \$3,000,000—and he stated he is ready to do it—the contractor refuses to sign the contract unless he is given permission to charge an amount over and above \$3,000,000,

and that the Secretary under the law possibly can not do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I must disagree very radically with the gentleman. The facts are that they are ready to sign, and the Secretary refuses.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman say that I am not correct in saying that the act provides that he shall do it, provided the amount does not exceed \$3,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is correct in that statement, but why does he not do it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Because the contractor refuses to sign that contract, and the Secretary of the Treasury has put it up to him time and again.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I must disagree with the gentleman, and state that the contractors, Shank & Co., have gone to the Secretary of the Treasury day after day and urged him to sign that contract, and instead of doing that he writes notes to Congress.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. And I want to reaffirm the statement just made by the gentleman from South Dakota, that the contractor has again and again expressed his readiness to sign for the \$3,000,000, and that the department refuses to act.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I believe that the figures will show that we will need 30,000 beds within the next two years for men who suffered by reason of this war.

In the office of the Surgeon General they tell me that there will be 7,448 mental and nervous cases in Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and 3,540 tubercular cases, and I believe the figures are correct. But they could come in with cleaner hands if they would give the reason for the direct refusal to comply with the mandatory acts of Congress ordering them to take over this great Broad View Hospital, which would have given 2,500 more beds months ago.

I know very little concerning the facts of the Broad View Hospital except as I have discovered them from official documents. But from reading the hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate of the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, from reading hearing No. 13 of the hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of this session, I can not escape the conclusion that men highly connected with the present administration have refused to build and accept this hospital because of some personal feeling toward Mr. Edward Hines, who lives in Chicago, or some one connected with him.

The Inspector General of the Army says affirmatively that the building of this hospital will cost Mr. Hines or his associates \$750,000, and when I find that they will not accept that contribution there must be something radically wrong. That statement is found on page 1088 of the hearings before the Senate committee and is as follows:

That the carrying out of the Speedway project as proposed by the Shank Co. and backed by Mr. Edward Hines involved a loss or contribution by these interests of an amount approximately \$750,000. That the purpose of Mr. Hines in furthering the project was the patriotic and commendable one of providing a permanent, modern, fireproof hospital in place of the temporary, nonfireproof structures utilized in various localities for that purpose, generously inspired by the loss of his son, Lieut. Edward Hines, who died in the service after three months in a hospital in France. That Mr. George H. Shank, president of the Shank Co., is entitled to share with Mr. Hines in the credit of the undertaking, for the proposal included no remuneration in any form to him, either as profit, commission, or other personal compensation, and he had voluntarily proposed to Mr. Hines to share in proportion to his interest in the property the loss on the investment by reason of the undertaking.

I happen to have no personal interest in Chicago and no interest in anyone connected with Chicago, except as I would have the same interest in anyone in the United States, but when I read this record and find that Edward Hines, because of the fact that he lost a son in the service, has been willing to suffer a loss of three-quarters of a million dollars of his own money to insure that the comrades of his son, who saw service in France, may have hospital treatment, and that he is prevented from doing so by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Treasury, it shakes my faith in human nature.

That is a statement of a representative of the administration. I find that Mr. Hines is the only millionaire in the United States who lost a son in this war, and he is willing to build a memorial for the comrades of that son. Not only do they refuse to build hospitals but they will not accept a hospital that a man wants to build as a memorial to his son.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. I want to add just there that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service has expressed a willingness to accept this contract on condition that Congress would add two millions and a half more for other buildings.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. That statement is borne out by the record and by the documents that I have quoted.

I can not understand how any man, by reason of political or personal dislike of any individual, would prohibit the soldiers of the United States Army from securing the hospital facilities that they need. The record is clear that these men have refused such hospital facilities, although it does not disclose their reasons.

In conclusion, I can only say that the responsibility for the deaths that come on account of lack of hospital facilities—and such deaths are now coming—will be directly chargeable to the men who did not proceed to spend the money we have appropriated in the way it was ordered to be expended, and to do it at once. It is more cruel to cause the death of a man by depriving him of hospital facilities, which his condition demands, than it is to shoot him.

I can only say that it is the duty of every Member of Congress to investigate the hospital facilities in his own section of the country. If these conditions which I found personally there and which I have proved in these remarks can exist in the vicinity of Chicago, it ought to put every American citizen on notice to look at the hospital facilities in every other section of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use three minutes in explanation of my statement with reference to the Shank contract. There certainly is no reason for any difference as to the facts. My information came from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Glass. He told me that when he attempted to comply with the act of Congress directing him to sign the contract with Shank & Co., based on the specifications of September and October of last year, Shank & Co. refused to sign the contract unless he would agree that in addition to the \$3,000,000 he would agree to pay to Shank & Co. a sum representing the increase in the cost of labor and material over and above what it was last September and October; and that he felt that under the provisions of the act he had no authority to do this; that he was limited to the \$3,000,000; that he was, therefore, going to write a letter to the Congress setting forth these facts. Personally, I have no knowledge of the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of War could have closed that contract as soon as that act became a law in March, 1919, without the expenditure of an additional dollar?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Not at all; because when the gentleman and I aided in passing that law, we provided that he should close the contract provided that for the amount of money appropriated he could build a hospital suited to the needs of the Public Health Service. That required that the Secretary of the Treasury first ascertain the needs of the Public Health Service. The statement as to their needs was sent to the Supervising Architect to determine whether or not such a building as would answer the needs of the Public Health Service could be constructed within the limit of cost.

Now, the gentleman knows, too, that in June last, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] showed on this floor—and I assisted him in showing it—we had more beds than we needed. Since that time the demand for beds has increased more than they ever anticipated, and, of course, the gentleman is entirely wrong in his statement that under that act they have not spent a dollar, because in the hearings, if he will turn to page 704, if he wants information on the subject, he will find a detailed list of the hospitals taken over and the number of beds in each. It will be enlightening.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am going to use two minutes more of my time.

Now, on page 704, the gentleman will find in the statement of Dr. Stimpson, in response to a question of Mr. Goon as to whether or not he had taken over the seven hospitals involved in the act of March 13, to which the gentleman from South Dakota referred, the following:

Did you take over those seven hospitals?

Dr. STIMPSON. Yes; we took over 20 hospitals altogether from the Army, of which 17 are now being operated.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a list of those hospitals for the record?

Dr. STIMPSON. Yes; I will put a list in the record.

(The list referred to is as follows:)

Hospital.	Location.	Bed capacity.	Number of patients on Dec. 20.
Now in operation:			
Alexandria.....	Alexandria, La.....	500	233
Biltmore.....	Biltmore, N. C.....	400	114
Boston (general, No. 10).....	Boston, Mass.....	300	258
Chicago, No. 2.....	Chicago, Ill.....	530	517
Dansville, N. Y.....	Dansville, N. Y.....	250	1,256
Camp Cody.....	Deming, N. Mex.....	850	(?)
East Norfolk.....	East Norfolk, Mass.....	230	64
Greenville.....	Greenville, S. C.....	800	766
New Haven.....	New Haven, Conn.....	470	435
Polyclinic.....	New York City, N. Y.....	310	252
Norfolk.....	Norfolk, Va.....	265	227
Palo Alto.....	Palo Alto, Calif.....	389	389
Parkview.....	Hoboken, Pa.....	500	248
Perryville.....	Perryville, Md.....	100	38
St. Louis, No. 4.....	St. Louis, Mo.....	605	325
West Roxbury.....	West Roxbury, Mass.....	300	28
Markleton.....	Markleton, Pa.....	250	(?)
Closed:			
Camp Logan.....	Houston, Tex.....	850	.....
Camp Hancock.....	Augusta, Ga.....	850	.....
Camp Johnston.....	Jacksonville, Fla.....	830	.....

<sup>1</sup> Above capacity.

<sup>2</sup> Just being opened.

<sup>3</sup> Just opened.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not until I give you these lists. I can not add rapidly enough to tell you the total number of beds offhand.

Then, in addition to that, the chairman asked whether or not he had a statement showing the amount expended on each of these hospitals. He replied that he had. Then he went on to show the status of the money spent. Of the appropriation for \$750,000, the expenditures authorized were \$471,186, and the amounts allotted for expenditures were \$200,987, leaving a balance of \$77,826. That list follows:

Status of appropriation, \$750,000, as authorized under public act 328, for construction work to be undertaken at projects transferred from Army, Navy, or other departments, and for items estimated for the continuation of activities mentioned in section 2 of the above-mentioned act, as of Dec. 26, 1918.

Project.	Allotted.	Authorized.	Unexpended allotment.	Estimated future requirements.
Technical services.....	\$18,500.00	\$18,500.00		
Alexandria, La.....	75,000.00	32,563.49	\$42,436.51	\$25,000.00
Deming, N. Mex.....		320.00		20,000.00
Jacksonville, Fla.....		1,148.50		(1)
Houston, Tex.....		128.25		10,000.00
Palo Alto, Calif.....	80,000.00	18,314.22	61,685.78	
Perryville, Md.....	110,000.00	40,767.56	69,232.44	75,000.00
Greenville, S. C.....	87,000.00	280,094.84		75,000.00
Cape May, N. J.....		16,299.80		10,000.00
Hoboken, Pa.....	24,000.00	13,045.00	10,955.00	10,000.00
Chicago, Ill.....	5,000.00	3,479.14	1,520.86	
Corpus Christi, Tex.....	5,000.00	62.95	4,937.05	
Dansville, N. Y.....	5,000.00	6,070.00		10,000.00
St. Louis, Mo. (2).....	5,000.00	758.38	4,241.62	5,000.00
New Haven, Conn.....	8,000.00	2,021.22	5,978.78	25,000.00
West Roxbury, Mass.....		1,952.89		50,000.00
Augusta, Ga.....				(3)
Helena, Mont.....				100,000.00
Boise, Idaho.....				75,000.00
East Norfolk, Mass.....				10,000.00
Norfolk, Va.....		35,582.49		
Markleton, Pa.....		90.00		
New projects to be taken over (1920).....				\$ 500,000.00
Total.....	432,500.00	471,186.64	200,987.18	1,000,000.00

<sup>1</sup> Salvaged.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated.

Appropriation.....	\$750,000.00
Expenditures authorized.....	\$471,186.64
Amounts allotted for expenditure.....	200,987.18
	672,173.82

Balance..... 77,826.18

You will find on the next page—706—of the hearings a list of properties leased by or transferred to the Public Health Service, for which funds were spent for alterations—a detailed list, showing every place and exactly what was spent on each building. The hearing was replete with information, so complete, I am satisfied, that if the gentleman had seen it he would not have made the criticism he has.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It is true, the gentleman will admit, the Secretary of the Treasury has not complied



with the act of Congress ordering him to take over the Speedway Hospital.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Because I have told you, and will tell you again, that the act says he can not spend over \$3,000,000, and the contractor refuses to sign unless he receives, in addition to the \$3,000,000, a sum representing the increase in the cost of labor and material over what it was last October. If the gentleman is authorized to speak for the contractor, I guarantee he can sign that contract in an hour if he will sign it without that provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. It would be a wonderful thing to do.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman from South Carolina is convinced that the Secretary's refusal to sign, the failure to sign, is because the contractor refused to sign the contract authorized by the law, but puts additional conditions upon him, making additional costs, then has not the gentleman from South Dakota very much wronged the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I will say that the contractor has been ready and willing and anxious to sign. He has had his representative before the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of War, day after day, since March, 1918.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the contractor in speaking, not to you, but in discussing the matter with the Secretary of the Treasury, did refuse to sign for the \$3,000,000 provided by law—the only contract the Secretary can sign—if that be a fact, then you have done the Secretary of the Treasury an injustice.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. No; I have not. The gentleman is proceeding along the wrong theory.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Secretary will sign if the contractor will sign the contract for the amount provided in the act.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. He could have done that any time since 1917.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman will put his hand on the contractor, and he will sign a contract without the provisions such as I have stated, requiring the payment of money outside the limit of cost, the contract can be signed in an hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I think the contractor is in Chicago.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. How do you know that the Secretary of the Treasury says what you have alleged?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. According to the reports.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The Secretary of the Treasury has explained this thing to me as I have stated, and I know he tells the truth.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do not think he does.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, permission for the printing of which was granted, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,  
Washington, January 27, 1920.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Responding a little more definitely to your inquiry made a while ago over the phone, I desire to state that with reasonable promptness after the approval of the act of December 24, 1919, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire and complete the Speedway Hospital main building, with five auxiliary buildings, within the appropriation of \$3,000,000 and in accordance with plans and specifications designated by the act, I directed the offices of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, in conjunction with the authorities of the Public Health Service, immediately to prepare for my signature a contract in literal compliance with the law. The owners of the Speedway property and the contractors, whose tentative proposals indicated a willingness to complete the main hospital building and the five auxiliary buildings within the limits of the \$3,000,000 appropriation, were invited to a conference at the Treasury on January 8 to agree upon a form and the terms of a contract. No agreement was reached at the first conference, and negotiations were resumed next day. At these conferences it clearly appeared that the owners of the Speedway Hospital property and the contractors insisted upon relating any contract which should be drawn to the old contract of the Shank Co. proposed to be made with the War Department to meet a war emergency, but rejected by that department, and which contract the Supervising Architect's office insisted was neither essential nor adaptable to a contract such as was contemplated by the act of December 24, 1919.

The owners of the Speedway property and the contractors, themselves and through their attorneys, insisted that a provision should be embodied in the contract fixing some date from which increased costs should be computed for all materials and labor required in the work, and giving the contractors a status in the Court of Claims, apparently with the approval of the Treasury, to recover from the Government any and all costs in excess of the \$3,000,000 appropriated by Congress. The owners of the property, the contractor, and their attorney, according to a written report of the conference furnished me, were asked the specific question if they would sell the property, complete the main building, and construct the five auxiliary buildings according to the plans and specifications and within the \$3,000,000 limitation provided by law. They answered decisively in the negative.

When the result of these various negotiations was reported to me I instantly gave instructions to the law department and the Supervising Architect's office of the Treasury to immediately have prepared a contract in strict compliance with the statute for the acquisition and completion of the Speedway Hospital project, to be promptly submitted to the owners of the property and the proposed contractors for the work.

The contract thus directed to be drawn was prepared by the architect's office, approved by the law officer of the department, signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and submitted to the owners of the Speedway Hospital property and the Shank Co., contractors, on January 22, and there the matter rests. There has not been a minute since Congress directed the purchase and completion of this enterprise under designated plans and specifications within a limit of \$3,000,000 that the Secretary of the Treasury has not been willing and anxious to execute with the owners and contractors a contract for the proposition in literal compliance with the statute; and of this fact the owners and contractor, as well as their attorney, are perfectly well aware.

Replying to your inquiry as to what has been done under the act authorizing the appropriation of \$9,000,000 for hospital purposes, as indicated above, a \$3,000,000 contract has been prepared and sent to the owners and proposed contractors for the Speedway Hospital at Chicago.

(2) At Dawsonsprings, Ky., plans and specifications for a sanatorium with a capacity of 500 beds were submitted and bids obtained which exceeded the limit of the authorized appropriation. These plans were revised and other bids obtained, which, I am advised, are being to-day considered in the architect's office. A contract has been awarded at the Dawsonsprings project for a road on a yardage basis, estimated to cost \$120,000, and is 66 per cent completed.

(3) In the matter of the hospital at Norfolk, Va., a portion of the site has been transferred by the War Department to the Treasury Department. The remaining portion is to be acquired by condemnation, and working drawings for the hospital are well under way.

(4) At the New York Marine Hospital a contract has been awarded for a kitchen and mess hall amounting to \$159,902.87, leaving a balance of about \$40,000 for alteration and remodeling of existing and authorized buildings.

(5) Of the appropriation of \$150,000 for a general hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex., \$120,000 has been expended in its purchase.

(6) Of the sum of \$1,500,000 authorized to be expended for the purchase of land and buildings suitable for hospitals \$450,000 has been expended for the purchase and remodeling of the buildings at Waukesha, Wis.; \$350,000 has been expended for the purchase and remodeling of a receiving hospital at Hudson and Jay Streets, New York City; \$175,000 has been expended for the purchase and alteration of a small hospital at Atlanta, Ga.; \$150,000 has been expended for the purchase and remodeling of a general hospital at Lake City, Fla.; \$36,885 has been set aside for technical services, making a total of \$1,161,885 of this appropriation allotted, leaving a balance of \$338,115. Of the \$750,000 authorized to be expended in the remodeling of hospitals transferred by the other departments of the Government, principally the Army and Navy, all has been expended except \$77,826.18. Of the \$550,000 appropriated for a hospital plant within the District of Columbia none has been spent, for the reason that the department has been unable to secure a satisfactory site on Government property, as required by law; but I have asked authority from Congress to use the fund to purchase a site not on Government land. Meanwhile the department has been compelled to rent hospital facilities out of the general fund.

Very truly, yours,

HON. JAMES F. BYRNES,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

CARTER GLASS.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. McKENZIE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bill of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution which appropriates \$1,000,000 for the investigation and prevention of influenza; and

S. 3722. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Alford Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Savannah River.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill H. R. 4382, entitled "An act to confer on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to determine the respective rights of and differences between the Fort Berthold Indians and the Government of the United States, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

#### SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to myself on this question.

When this matter was before the committee, we attempted to find out what the situation was with regard to the Speedway Hospital, but the Public Health Service could only tell us that the question of the Speedway Hospital was then under consideration by the Shank Co. and the Secretary of the Treasury. Since this debate started one of the clerks from the Committee on Appropriations has brought me the copy of a letter signed by the Shank Co., under date of January 7, 1920, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury. Now, I do not personally know anything about the controversy, but Mr. Bennet, formerly a Member of this House, called to see me day before yesterday. He represents the Shank Co. He said after this matter was taken up here a week or two ago the question was as to whether or not the Public Health Service was going to get two large elevators for this hospital, and the trouble was that those elevators were not specified in the contract. Mr. Shank spoke up and said, "How much do you estimate they will cost?" My recollection is that it was represented they would cost \$40,000 or \$50,000. Mr. Shank said, "We will put them in and give them to you." The question then was as to electric-light fixtures. The Shank Co. had held that it was not a part of the construc-

tion to give a part of the fixtures; that they were to cost about \$26,000; and Mr. Shank said, "If you will allow me to substitute, where you have specified solid brass and solid bronze, the kind of hardware the ordinary business man or hospital would put in, I will put in the light fixtures without cost, although it is not specified in the contract. And he further agreed, so Mr. Bennet told me, to sign the contract and let the Secretary rearrange the interior in any way he wanted, and he would complete it within \$3,000,000. I do not know anything about it, but here is a letter from the Shank Co. to the Secretary that is altogether different from what I understand the Secretary's attitude is.

It is addressed to the Hon. Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury, and reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 7, 1920.

HON. CARTER GLASS,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington.

DEAR SIR: Referring to our letter of October 16, 1919, in which we propose to complete the Broadview Hospital, at Chicago, in accordance with the plans of July 15, August 16, and September 23, 1919—

While I do not have these dates in mind, yet my recollection is that those are the dates of the plans referred to in the legislation. I read further from the letter:

for the sum authorized therefor by statute, and having been informed that because of the recent legislation it is desired to substitute for the plans of three of the sections plans constructing those sections for personnel, we take pleasure in stating that we will construct those sections according to the plans which will later be submitted to us by your department under our bid. In order to save any question, we state that we are making this offer before any detailed plans whatever have been drawn and agreeing in advance to accept such detailed plans when drawn.

We trust that this concession on our part will permit the immediate signing of the contract.

If the contract is signed, we can then be proceeding with the auxiliary buildings and the four sections which are unchanged, while the detailed changes of the three remaining sections are being completed.

Yours, very truly,

SHANK CO.,  
By GEO. H. SHANK, President.

Now, I repeat, I know nothing about this personally.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. GOOD. The 7th of January.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury to me was that he believed the contract was to be signed, and my recollection is that it was prepared for signature, and when it was prepared and presented to him this statement was made about the inclusion of an agreement to cover any increase in the cost of labor over and above the specifications of the contract of October 1.

Mr. GOOD. I know nothing about it except what Mr. Bennet himself told me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GOOD. I will yield one minute more to myself, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bennet further stated to me that after everything was agreed upon, after the conference with Mr. Moyle, that Mr. Moyle was willing to sign the contract, but told Mr. Bennet he would come back in the morning, as he would have to see Mr. Glass. When he returned the next day Mr. Moyle told him that the Secretary would not sign the contract, because the Secretary wanted a new contract drawn and would not sign the old contract. Now, as I said, I do not know anything personally about this controversy, but I am unable to harmonize the letter just read with the Secretary's claim.

Mr. KITCHIN. I submit that the letter itself, of January 7, shows that the contractors were demanding a contract in excess of the former arrangement.

Mr. GOOD. No. They say right in the letter "within the authorized limit of cost."

Mr. KITCHIN. That is, provided they would take some reductions that they wanted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am not familiar with the present status of the Chicago hospital, although I have had occasion, as a member of the Committee on Rules, to learn a good deal about its history in the past. I also have some other hospital history, and I think that in order to keep the record straight, in view of the charges and intimations of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], it would be well for gentlemen here to refresh their memories concerning it.

The war-risk insurance bill, as it originally passed, provided that honorably discharged soldiers and sailors should be assured of proper hospital treatment, and that duty was imposed by the terms of the law, which was passed unanimously, upon the Public Health Service, which is under the Treasury Department of the United States. In pursuance of that policy the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department began to seek for sites quite early, some of them before the armistice was signed, and among other places one was definitely settled upon, and that was a point in the State of Kentucky called Dawsonsprings.

A bill was introduced and reported favorably as an independent bill, I think unanimously, from the committee having it in charge, to appropriate for and to construct a hospital for those discharged soldiers and sailors, to be under the direction of the Public Health Service of the Treasury Department, at Dawson-springs, Ky.

That bill went to its place on the calendar. Effort after effort was made to get it up for consideration in the House by unanimous consent. It was objected to by the then minority leader of the House, the present honorable Speaker of this House of Representatives, until finally it became necessary for the Committee on Rules to bring in a special rule making that in order, either as an independent measure or as an amendment upon an appropriation bill—I have forgotten which for the moment. That was brought in unanimously from the Committee on Rules, but when it reached the floor of the House it met objection and opposition here. Gentlemen upon that side of the Chamber opposed that bill upon its original passage, principally, so far as I could determine, simply because the hospital was to be located in the State of Kentucky, and it passed by an almost strict party vote, as I recall.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, it was expected that other hospitals would be located in other sections of the country.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Does the gentleman remember what kind of a hospital that was?

Mr. GARRETT. I do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It was for tubercular patients, and the opposition was based on the ground that that was not a proper place for it.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman from Iowa got that idea in his head at the time, and he never has gotten it out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GARRETT. Tubercular cases were referred to, and that site was recommended by the Public Health Service for that reason. But the gentleman from Iowa was always in error and, apparently, he is still in error in the belief that it was to be exclusively for tubercular cases.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman read the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations on the Dawsonsprings project?

Mr. GARRETT. I have not read the recent hearings. But I am recounting the facts of that transaction now, in view of the statement made here by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. This is the site which the experts of the Public Health Service selected.

Now, what happened? We passed that bill, and it passed the Senate and it became a law, and during this Congress, after the political complexion of the House had changed, just before the end of the last fiscal year, on that very day that the fiscal year closed, gentlemen from the Committee on Appropriations came before this House with a proposition to repeal this legislation establishing this hospital at Dawsonsprings, along with other legislation, and I am justified from what occurred then in stating that it was only because of the fact that certain gentlemen upon that side, members of the Committee on Rules, were out of the city, and it was requisite for the Democrats on that committee to furnish a quorum, that that hospital was not destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee. If the gentleman desires, I will yield him five minutes more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate in his statement. The proposition before the Committee on Rules was to submit the whole question to the House before final action was taken. The proposition was not to repeal the legislation.



Mr. GARRETT. It was designed to stop the work, just as a provision put into the bill and voted for, I think, thoughtlessly by many to stop the payment for purchases of land taken for Army purposes. Had it not been for the facts which I have recited, that would have been stopped.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I was not in the last House. Was it contemplated that the hospital at Dawsonsprings, Ky., would care for tubercular patients and for other classes of patients also?

Mr. GARRETT. It was.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman believe it is wise and in accordance with modern practice to mix tubercular patients with other patients in the same hospital?

Mr. GARRETT. Oh, the hospital was to be arranged and, according to the authorities, that could be done—I am not an expert upon the question—but, according to the authorities of the Public Health Service, who are charged with this responsibility, and who, I take it, would not wish to do any wrong to any honorably discharged soldier or sailor of the United States, it could be properly arranged so that they could be taken care of there.

I have recited these facts, Mr. Chairman, simply in order that the record may be kept straight. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. GOOD. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to say that I have no quarrel with anybody anywhere about where the hospital facilities are located. I have no quarrel with those who wanted Dawsonsprings, or with those who wanted Broadview, or with those who wanted hospitals in any other place; but I have been deeply interested in having sufficient facilities afforded wherever they might be needed to accommodate the men who contracted either wounds or disease in the military service.

I was interested in reading the hearings, covering several hundred pages, on the pending bill, and to notice that the hospital which was authorized at Dawsonsprings is not yet under construction, but that some time early last May an engineer named Graff was sent to Dawsonsprings to make a topographical survey of the grounds donated to the Government upon which this hospital for tubercular patients is to be located. And in connection with the service which Mr. Graff was sent to perform I notice that the hearings disclose the fact that he was directed to get into communication with a man named Troendle. It seems that Mr. Troendle is the "Pooh-Bah" of Dawsonsprings; that he is somewhat identified with the proposed hotel which is to be located there as a summer resort; that he is also the president or controlling owner and chief managing director of the Brandenburg Construction Co. and the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. as well.

Before Mr. Graff went to Dawsonsprings he was told that he would find Mr. Troendle a very accommodating gentleman, and that if he was unable to find office facilities in Dawsonsprings he might feel sure that he would be accommodated in Mr. Troendle's office; and I believe Mr. Graff finally accepted the tender of office space in the office of Mr. Troendle. He was directed to make a topographical survey of the land which had been given to the Government. He was told that Mr. Troendle had been very kind in the matter of donating part of the money contributed by the citizens of that neighborhood to those who originally owned the land before the donation was made to the Government, and Mr. Graff after having made some attempt to get men to make the survey that he went there to make, and being unable to get men, called on Mr. Troendle, or the Brandenburg Construction Co., and finally recommended the award of a contract to them to make the survey on the basis of about 55 cents per acre. Later on it developed that it was necessary to construct a highway over which the supplies and materials that might be needed in the construction of the buildings later to be erected would have to be hauled.

It was disclosed also that the Brandenburg Co., through Mr. Troendle, said to Mr. Graff that Mr. Moyle, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Perry, the directing engineer of the Public Health Service, and somebody else connected with the Public Health Service as assistant to the Surgeon General, were his friends and that he was to be given any contract that might be let, regardless of what the contract price should be; and while Mr. Graff did recommend that a contract be let for the topographical survey and did make an estimate of what it would cost to build the highway, which runs for a distance of about 2 miles through hilly ground, some of which has to have

cuts and some fills, he did not recommend that any contract be let to the Brandenburg or the Dawsonsprings Construction Co.; but he discovered that in connection with and supplemental to the contract for the topographical survey, which really amounted to very little in dollars, the Public Health Service here made a contract for the construction of the highway over a totally different line of survey than that recommended by Mr. Graff, to the Brandenburg or to the Dawsonsprings Co., either one of which is the same as the other, and both controlled and operated and directed by Mr. Troendle, and that the price at which the contract was let amounted to about \$31,500 a mile more than the estimated cost to the Government, as suggested by the Government representative. And the Government representative in his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations says that he was not consulted about letting contracts to these people, but was directed that they should be permitted to proceed with the work. And that is not all; but the Brandenburg Construction Co., through Mr. Troendle, are not only permitted to do the contract work at double the cost estimated by the Government representatives, but they are also permitted to do their own surveying, their own engineering work, to make their own estimates of the quantities of material taken from the cuts and placed in the fills; and that whereas the Illinois Central Railroad Co. are paying \$1.20 a cubic yard for taking out rock in that neighborhood along the cuts for the extension of their own railway, the Government of the United States is paying \$4.50 a yard for that same kind of rock work.

Mr. Graff, who is the Government engineer, says that he estimated the cost of this rock work at \$2.50 a yard, and yet the Public Health Service, charged with the responsibility of spending the people's money for facilitating the care of the sick, wounded, and dying men who served in the war, goes about squandering the people's money in this reckless and unjustifiable manner.

Now, I do not know of what use it is to appropriate money for the care of soldiers and place the disposition of that money in charge of men who have no regard for its proper expenditure.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I just want to advise the gentleman from Illinois that this gentleman at Dawsonsprings about whom he has been talking so much is one of the biggest political leaders that the Republican Party has in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. MADDEN. I would not care what he was or where he was or who he was if his action was not in conformity with strict justice and integrity.

I do not care whether he is a Republican, a Democrat, or a Socialist. I do not care who he is or who his friends are. He could not spend this money out of the Public Treasury unless somebody in charge of the money authorized him to do it. How can Troendle be blamed? He is a private citizen.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. When the Surgeon General and the representative of the Shank Co. were before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House he offered to sign the contract for the \$3,000,000, but the Surgeon General refused unless \$2,500,000 more should be appropriated by Congress for additional buildings that they were demanding.

Mr. MADDEN. I am making no charge against Mr. Troendle or any other man. What I am doing is criticizing the reckless, useless waste of public money by public officials who are sworn to an honest discharge of their duties.

Of course, if they are so little interested in the conservation of the health of those who gave everything they had to their country in the hour of its direst need as to squander the money set apart for their care in such a way as this, they are unfit to occupy the high places which they occupy.

There is not a large amount of money involved in this; it amounts to \$65,000 for 2 miles of road construction—more than it should amount to. But on the same principle that it is wrong to squander millions, it is equally wrong to squander thousands. If this policy has been pursued—and the evidence shows it to be the fact—in respect to the expenditure of this small preliminary sum, what do you suppose will happen when they begin the construction and before they complete the buildings? I have no doubt whatever but that Dawsonsprings is an ideal spot for a tuberculosis hospital. It is in the hills, surrounded by all the attractions of nature—pure air, good water, and everything to be desired—and we are in the position of having not begun the work for which the money has long since been appropriated; but that particular work in road construction has been begun badly, for here the money of the people, intended for the care of

the sick and the wounded American soldier, has been squandered and wasted without any consideration as to what effect its waste would have on the care of these men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks the privilege of extending his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KINCHELOE].

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am very much impressed with the seriousness with which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has addressed you, showing his anxiety at this late day for the care and comfort of the disabled, discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] has also addressed you today and in his address criticized the Bureau of Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Treasury for not furnishing sufficient hospital facilities for these soldiers. It comes with bad grace for the Republican members of this House to criticize the Secretary of the Treasury, the Bureau of Public Health Service; or anyone else, for the insufficient hospital facilities for these boys, because when this legislation was before Congress from time to time during the period of October, 1918, to March, 1919, practically every Republican member of Congress did all he could to prevent this legislation. Now, when the situation presents itself as serious, as predicted at that time by the Bureau of Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Treasury, these gentlemen become very solicitous about the welfare of these unfortunate boys.

On the 11th of September, 1918, I introduced a bill to establish a sanatorium for disabled, discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines at Dawsonsprings, Ky., and at that time the patriotic people in and around Dawsonsprings pledged themselves to give to the Government 5,000 acres of land in fee simple if the Government would erect this hospital there.

This bill received the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and went on the calendar. We then went before the Rules Committee of the House, and this committee reported a rule which gave it a privileged status. This was in the fall of 1918, just before the closing day of Congress; and when this rule was called up by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], who had the matter in charge, the then minority leader and present Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILBERT], raised the point of no quorum, and the result was that by the concerted efforts of the Republican side of the House the bill was delayed until after the November election. When Congress convened in December, 1918, the bill was brought up for consideration, and there was a concerted effort of the Republicans of the House then to defeat this bill, and the only Republican Member of the House who was friendly to it, who was present during the consideration of this bill, was the gentleman from Tennessee, the late Hon. Dick Austin. This bill became a law in spite of the concerted efforts of the Republican side of the House; and now the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] comes ready to shed crocodile tears in behalf of the disabled, discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and criticizes every effort of the Bureau of Public Health Service to expedite the building of this sanatorium at Dawsonsprings. He makes broad charges of extravagance, if not fraud; and on what ground does he make the charge?

Mr. MADDEN. On the ground of evidence before the committee.

Mr. KINCHELOE. On the sole testimony of Maj. Graff, who was at that time representing the Bureau of Public Health Service there, but who is no longer in the service.

The ground for this sanatorium is situated 2½ miles from the city of Dawsonsprings, Ky. First and foremost, we tried to get the Illinois Central Railroad to run a switch to the site. I went before the Railroad Administration and others went before the Illinois Central Railroad Co., but they refused to build it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I can not yield now. We then thought we might get the Army people at Camp Knox to come down and build the road for the Government. I am not here in the interest of any contractor. I have no pecuniary interest in this matter whatever, but I am anxious to see this hospital built at once, for it should have been built long ago and would have been if it had not been for the filibuster on the part of the Republican side of this House.

The Dawsonsprings Construction Co. has been the lowest bidder on every bid submitted. There has never been anything to conceal in the whole transaction, and in view of the fact that this company has been the lowest bidder on all bids it is entitled to these contracts. The Bureau of Public Health Service sent this man Graff to Dawsonsprings, and unfortunately his name

is spelled G-r-a-f-f, without the "t." He went there to have the surveying done in order that the plans and specifications could be drawn as quickly as possible. He was unable to get any surveyors to do the work, even after trying the Government surveyors at Camp Knox. The Dawsonsprings Construction Co., of which Mr. T. R. Troendle is the head, did not want to build the road and cared nothing about the surveying contract, except to expedite the work as much as possible. Finally the Bureau of Public Health Service submitted plans for bids for this survey, and the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. was the lowest bidder, and this man Graff himself recommended the acceptance of its bid, as the hearings will show and as he admits on cross-examination by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. MADDEN. That was for the survey.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I decline to yield and do not want these interruptions to be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky declines to yield.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Then the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. made the survey. The question of road building then came up, after failing to get the railroad company or the Railroad Administration to build the spur track. Bids were submitted, and the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. got the contract to build over 2 miles of the road—that is, the grubbing, removing of dirt and rock—and up to December 31 the Dawsonsprings Construction Co. lost over \$23,000 on that job. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], if he will get some one to finish this we will not only turn it over, but will stand half the expense.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman mean that he is interested in it?

Mr. KINCHELOE. No; I am speaking for the people down there who gave these 5,000 acres. No; I am not nearly as much interested in it as the gentleman is in some other propositions where much larger expenditures are to be made.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the gentleman specify something I am interested in.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am no more interested in it than the gentleman is in the Speedway Hospital at Chicago.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not interested in anything at all.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Neither am I, so we are even on this proposition. The patriotic people in and around Dawsonsprings, Ky., gave 5,000 acres of land to the Government upon which to erect this hospital, of which 400 acres was owned by the Simmons Hardware Co., and the Bureau of Public Health Service will tell you that they will get enough coal from this land not only to coal the hospital at Dawsonsprings but to coal the hospital in Chicago and every other hospital in the Public Health Service of the United States and save at least \$1.50 per ton. Where are there any other people in the United States that have made as generous an offer as this to the Government?

This man Graff, on whose testimony you rely for the charges you make in criticizing the Bureau of Public Health Service and the Treasury Department, went to Mr. Troendle at Dawsonsprings for the purpose of making a proposition to him, which is thoroughly explained in an affidavit of Mr. Troendle, which is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
District of Columbia, ss:

The affiant, Theodore R. Troendle, states that he is president of the Dawsonsprings Construction Co.; and states that immediately after his company was given the contract for the grading of a part of the Government road extending from the Illinois Central tracks at Dawsonsprings, Ky., to the hospital site that Maj. Graff, engineer of the Bureau of Public Health, in charge of the work at Dawsonsprings, came to his office and said that he wanted to talk to him privately; that he said in this conversation that he thought this work should be done through him and not through the Washington office, and that if he, the said Troendle, would use his influence to have the executive part of this work done at Dawsonsprings, Ky., with him, the said Graff, in charge, that he, the said Graff, would "do business" with him. The affiant says that immediately upon the making of this statement by said Graff he declined to entertain this or any other proposition with the said Graff. The affiant further states that thereafter the said Graff became personally antagonistic to him and his company, and held up vouchers for pay for the work being done there by his company for four months; that his company began the work on this road in May and did not receive the first payment on same until October, because the said Graff failed and refused to send the vouchers for same to the department here. The affiant further states that he was compelled to, and did, come to Washington in order to get the matter adjusted, so that his company could begin to draw pay for this work.

THEODORE R. TROENDLE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Theodore R. Troendle this 20th day of January, 1920.

[SEAL.]

J. C. HAMMACK,  
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires January 10, 1921.

Mr. Troendle, of course, refused to entertain this or any other proposition, and after the Dawsonsprings Construction



Co. began work there in May on the survey it never received a voucher for pay from this man Graff, and not a cent of money for this work was paid until the latter part of October, and not then until Mr. Troendle, at his own expense, came to Washington and explained the situation to the Bureau of Public Health Service and the Treasury Department. This same man Graff sent another man to a Mr. Gary, who is secretary of the Forbes Manufacturing Co., of Hopkinsville, Ky., and who was one of the bidders on some of these buildings, and said that if he would "do business" with him that he, Graff, would be with him, which proposition was, of course, refused by Mr. Gary, because there is no more reputable business concern in the United States than the Forbes Manufacturing Co. and no man of higher integrity than Mr. Gary.

The question I want you to consider is, Was this contract for the road work reasonable? After these hearings Mr. Perry, the chief architect of the Bureau of Public Health Service, went to the Bureau of Public Roads of the Agricultural Department here and asked them to send a special representative to Dawson-springs to examine this road work and see whether this contract price was excessive. The department sent a man out of its office at Chicago, and on January 20, 1920, the Chicago office telegraphed the Agricultural Department here as follows:

SOUTH CHICAGO, ILL., January 20, 1920.

ROADS, AGRICULTURE, Washington:

Re tel Dawson-springs, Toms reports contract prices reasonable, considering time of year work must be done, except that prices for clearing, grubbing, and solid rock may be rather hard (high). Clearing and grubbing practically completed. Solid rock 55 per cent completed. If present contract cancelled sure better prices could not be secured. Labor prices high. Teams \$1 and labor 67 cents per hour. Report probably be mailed Thursday. Road not included in Federal aid program.

VOSHILL.

You will bear in mind that the contract let to the Dawson-springs Construction Co. for this work was as follows:

Earth excavation, 95 cents per cubic yard.

Loose rock, \$1.20 per cubic yard.

Solid rock, \$4.50 per cubic yard.

As you will see from the hearings, Mr. Perry was asked on examination if he would not submit to the committee similar contract prices for work done at other places, which he did, as shown beginning on page 8 of the hearings, and some of which are as follows:

For the three lowest bids for sewers at Barberton, Ohio, June 15, 1919: Earth excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$2.10; (b) \$1.25; (c) \$1.30. Rock excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$4; (b) \$5; (c) \$3.50.

For the three lowest bids received at West Hartford, Conn., by the commissioner for constructing eight covered masonry filters, and so forth: Earth excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$1; (b) \$1.10; (c) \$1.35. Rock excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$5; (b) \$4.25; (c) \$3.42.

Roads at Providence, R. I.: Earth excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$0.95; (b) \$1.35; (c) \$1.40. Rock excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$3; (b) \$4; (c) \$4.30.

Three lowest bids for dam work for Gilboa, N. Y.: Earth excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$1.75; (b) \$3.25; (c) \$2.50. Rock excavation, per cubic yard, (a) \$4; (b) \$5; (c) \$5.75. So we see from these bids submitted in other parts of the country that practically every one of them is higher than the bids accepted for this road work at Dawson-springs by the Dawson-springs Construction Co.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can describe the difference between the different kinds of rock?

Mr. KINCHELOE. No; the gentleman has never been to Dawson-springs and does not know what character of work is there. He is undertaking to prejudice Congress and the country against these activities simply because they are at Dawson-springs, Ky.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, I know the kind of rock at both places.

Mr. KINCHELOE. My own opinion is that the gentleman would not know sandrock from limestone rock.

I bear no brief for the Secretary of the Treasury, Carter Glass, or any official of the Bureau of Public Health Service, because neither of them need it, and what I might say could not add to or detract from the splendid record they have made. Secretary Glass served the country with great distinction in this House for many years and has made one of the ablest and most efficient Secretaries of the Treasury this country has ever had, and in a short time will take his seat as United States Senator from the State of Virginia in the Federal Senate, where, in my judgment, still greater things are in store for him. I have had an opportunity to associate with and know Mr. Perry, chief architect of the Bureau of Public Health Service, intimately for the last 18 months. I have never known a more industrious, faithful, and conscientious official than he, and I would gladly trust him any-

where, and if the membership of this House will take the trouble to investigate his record since he has been the architect of the Bureau of Public Health Service, I am sure they will agree with me. Gen. Rupert Blue, Surgeon General of the Bureau of Public Health Service, has prepared a statement which explains the action of his department, not only in this but in other matters, which I gladly insert here:

#### STATEMENTS RELATIVE TO PUBLIC ACT NO. 326.

JANUARY 21, 1920.

Public act No. 326, approved March 3, 1919, authorized additional hospital facilities for the care and treatment of war-risk insurance and Public Health Service beneficiaries and appropriated \$9,050,000 for specified projects, as follows:

For lease or contract with existing hospitals.....	\$300,000
For the purchase of Army General Hospital No. 15 at Corpus Christi, Tex.....	150,000
For the purchase of land and buildings.....	1,500,000
Repair and remodeling of hospitals taken over from the War Department.....	750,000
For the purchase and completion of Broadview Hospital at Chicago, Cook County, Ill.....	3,000,000
For construction (on land donated to the Government) of a sanatorium at Dawson-springs, Ky.....	1,500,000
For hospital at Norfolk, Va.....	900,000
For hospital (on Government land) at Washington, D. C.....	550,000
For additions to Marine Hospital, Stapleton, N. Y.....	190,000
For miscellaneous funds and equipment.....	210,000
	<b>9,050,000</b>

The need for additional hospital accommodations arose in connection with legislation known as the war-risk insurance act, which provides, among other things, hospital and other medical care and treatment for discharged sick and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, etc., and in addition the tremendously increased merchant marine, with which the Treasury Department is charged with the supply and administration of the above benefits, the hospitalization being delegated to the United States Public Health Service in conjunction with the War Risk Insurance Bureau.

The original bill presented to Congress provided a stipulated amount of money to build or otherwise acquire additional hospital accommodations wherever, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, they would best meet the public exigency.

The bill approved March 3 specified specific projects, at the discretion of the Secretary.

Among those approved by the Secretary was the taking over of hospitals from the Army under section 2 of the act; the acquisition of General Hospital No. 15 at Corpus Christi, Tex.; the purchase of Rest Haven Sanatorium at Waukesha, Wis.; the purchase of the House of Refuge, Hudson and Jay Streets, New York City, under section 6; construction at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y.; and numerous leasing projects under section 11; the acquisition of land at Dawson-springs, Ky.; the effort to enter into contract for the acquisition and completion of the Speedway property at Chicago, Ill., under section 7.

In carrying out the provisions of the act of March 3, 1919, especially in connection with section 2, which appropriated \$750,000 for remodeling hospitals taken over from the War Department and later the Navy Department, etc., it became necessary to request an additional sum of \$1,000,000, in connection with which hearings were given by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, at which inquiry was made as to the status of each item mentioned in the bill, particularly in regard to Dawson-springs, Ky.

On March 7, 1919, the Surgeon General in a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury recommended that Dawson-springs be approved as a location for a sanatorium, in line with the legislation, and stated, "This recommendation is founded on reports of inspection made by the medical adviser of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and representatives of the Public Health Service," and stated "that for the needs of the service there should be transferred to the Government two parcels of land comprising approximately 5,000 acres, consisting of 200 acres of coal land, situated on the north side of Dawson-springs, and approximately 4,800 acres of land on the south side of Dawson-springs." This recommendation was approved by the Secretary, the land actually donated consisting of 447 acres of coal land and 4,553 acres of other land suitable for a sanatorium, both located as above indicated.

In connection with the above legislation the Secretary, in a memorandum approved March 10, 1919, directed that the Public Health Service would be charged with the responsibility of selecting sites, the location of buildings thereon, the determination of the nature and extent of facilities desired for all new projects; that a hospital section be created in the Office of the Supervising Architect, whose duties it would be to prepare estimates, working drawings, and specifications for these projects, handling of contracts, and the supervision of construction in relation thereto.

In connection with the preliminary work on the Dawson-springs project it was necessary to secure surveys of the land and arrange approaches to the building site, which is approximately 2½ miles south of the city of Dawson-springs, and for this purpose a field engineer of the service, Mr. B. H. Graff, was, on April 24, 1919, detailed to take charge of the work in the field, and in a letter dated May 3, 1919, was instructed, among other things, to confer with the donor of the land, secure competitive proposals for making surveys, etc. As an incident to arranging approaches to the building site it became necessary to construct a roadway leading therefrom to the depot at Dawson-springs and thence to the city, with access to the coal fields on the north of Dawson-springs, and for which purpose the field engineer, in addition to his duties of directing the activities of the contractor's surveys, was, in a letter dated June 5, 1919, directed to devote especial attention to prospecting out a logical route of approach to the hospital for the new road work and to bring to the bureau's attention such other matters of importance as in his judgment should be given consideration; in connection with which, in an effort to expedite progress, the field engineer on July 4 was verbally directed to secure competitive proposals for certain subgrading, as a result of which a contract was entered into with the Brandenburg Construction Co. on September 23, 1919, for the work so advertised.

Besides the committee, there were present at the hearings Asst. Surg. Gen. W. G. Stimpson, in charge of the hospital division; Mr. N. V. Perry, constructing engineer; Mr. C. H. Stratton, assistant constructing engineer; and Mr. B. H. Graff, formerly employed as field engineer in charge of the construction work at Dawson-springs.

Among other things, Mr. Graff stated:

First, that he was directed to cooperate with Mr. Troendle in every possible way and to be guided by his recommendations and to accept of him office quarters and other accommodations; second, that the method of giving publicity to advertisements for the proposed work was such as to make it difficult for outside bidders to obtain information; third, that the prices paid under a contract resulting from such advertisement were twice as high as conditions justified; and fourth, that there was collusion between the officials of the Public Health Service and the contractor.

In reply to these statements the records show, first, that Mr. Graff was, on April 24, 1919, directed to proceed to Dawson Springs for the purpose of making surveys in connection with Government buildings to be erected, in accordance with detailed instructions to be issued in regard thereto; that his instructions dated May 3, 1919, directed him, among other things, that the bureau desired certain contour surveys for every 10 feet of elevation, also directed him to advertise for proposals for making these surveys, and further stated "That the bureau understands that Mr. Troendle will cooperate with you in every possible way and accommodate you with temporary office quarters without expense to the service"; "if you find it impracticable to make use of the accommodations offered, you should secure competitive proposals for a vacant room, affording light, heat, and janitor service, and to rental of such furniture as is needed. These proposals should be transmitted to the bureau with your definite recommendation as to acceptance." "You are also directed to take proposals for a survey"; "after making arrangements for the surveys, to make further explorations of the land between the site above indicated and the proposed depot for the purpose of making recommendations for a more direct wagon-road approach." He also was advised that no obligation must be incurred for the expenditure of money without first securing authority therefor; that all proposals secured for the supply of work should state definitely the terms and conditions and should be transmitted with his definite recommendation for acceptance, it being the practice of the department to accept the lowest bid for any given work, provided the contractor is thoroughly reliable and responsible.

In regard to the second statement the constructing engineer did, on July 4, 1919, while on a visit of inspection to Dawson Springs, in an effort to expedite construction of the road for which surveys were in a backward condition, directed the field engineer to prepare specifications for subgrading and to post notice that bids would be received for work in accordance therewith in the post office and in his own office, and also to advise any local bidders he might know that bids for such work would be received.

In connection with the above the field engineer stated at the hearings that he had only been directed to post a notice in the post office, and that he did not know of any local bidders who would be interested in road work, and therefore made no effort to secure wider competition than of the two firms represented in the bids received. Yet the records show that on July 1, 1919, four days before, the field engineer wrote to a Mr. R. C. Griffin, county road engineer, of Hopkins County, Ky., as follows:

"From your letter understand that bids for road work will be opened on the same date and would appreciate it if you would send me copies of the advertised proposal for this work, as there are a number of contractors who have expressed their desire to bid on the same. The writer will transmit these specifications as soon as received."

The field engineer wrote the specifications for the subgrading and handed copies to the Brandenburg Construction Co., whom he had previously recommended for making surveys, and to Mr. T. R. Troendle, representing the Dawson Springs Construction Co., which at that time, so far as the constructing engineer knew, had no relation to the Brandenburg Construction Co.; he apparently made no effort to get in touch with these contractors of whom he wrote to Mr. Griffin as being desirous of bidding on county road work.

A tentative draft of the Brandenburg Construction Co.'s bid was shown to the field engineer and the constructing engineer before being submitted and were transmitted to the bureau just prior to the latter's departure from Dawson Springs; while the Dawson Springs Construction Co.'s bids were mailed direct to Washington.

The bids for the various grades of work as submitted by the Brandenburg Construction Co., the lower of the two bids received, which was accepted August 22 and approved September 24, were for specified items, as follows:

For clearing 100 linear feet of road.....	\$30.00
For grubbing 100 linear feet of road.....	44.00
For earth excavation, per cubic yard.....	.95
For excavation, loose rock, per cubic yard.....	1.20
For excavation, solid rock, per cubic yard.....	4.50

The office engineer commented on these bids as follows:

"MEMORANDUM FOR MR. PERRY.

"JANUARY 3, 1920.

"Re: Cost data.

"I have worked over a great amount of cost data on road work compiled from roads actually built in Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia in the files of the Federal aid road division of the Agricultural Department, and from this data it seems that the unit prices for subgrading by the Brandenburg Construction Co. at Dawson Springs is not excessive. It is a little above the average cost for this work in some respects and lower in others, but in no respect is it unreasonable.

"The same source shows that the general average for hard-surfacing, including shoulders, should be for—

"Concrete, \$3.10 per square yard. (There is no data for reinforced concrete.)

"Macadam, \$1.39 per square yard.

"Bituminous macadam, \$2.30 per square yard.

"These hard-road averages are based on contract for from 5 to 10 miles of road, and it is reasonable to expect the small amount of work at Dawson Springs will run somewhat higher.

"(Signed) HERBERT HUNTINGTON."

Particular criticism was aimed at the price being paid for solid-rock excavation, statement being made that the Illinois Central Railroad Co. had made rock excavations in large volumes at Dawson Springs for \$1.25 per cubic yard; in answer to which there is a memorandum in the bureau to the effect that the president of the Illinois Central Railroad Co. will make an affidavit to the effect that the rock excavation at that point cost more than three times the \$1.25 per cubic yard stated by Mr. Graff.

To show that the bids for this work were not entitled to be considered excessive the following comparisons are made with advertised bids published in the Engineering News Record, May 22, 1919, page 304, pub-

lished bids received for solid-rock excavation for highways at \$4.35, and \$5.75 per cubic yard, while the same Record published in its January 15, 1919, edition quotes from \$3 to \$5. The bids published in the Engineering News Record from January, 1919, to January, 1920, of a large number of bids received for rock excavation, which show the prices running from \$2.75 a cubic yard to \$5.75 per cubic yard, the average being \$3.79 per cubic yard.

This bureau on January 2, 1920, requested the Bureau of Public Roads and Rural Engineering of the United States Department of Agriculture to make a special investigation of the road work at Dawson Springs, and for this purpose they sent one of their road engineers to Dawson Springs. As a result of this investigation, the bureau is in receipt of a telegram from that department's representative which, in substance, is, "That the contract price is reasonable, considering the time of year work must be done;" "that if the present contract is cancelled he is sure that better prices could not be secured."

It will be seen from the above statements and figures that the price being paid the Brandenburg Construction Co. is not out of line with the average prices quoted by bidders for similar work from New York to California during the past year. It may be stated that this contract was for subgrading only and was let at this time in order to expedite work pending the completion of final surveys for the finished roadway in order that competitive proposals might be based on actual working drawings for the final completion of all the road work in time for the transportation of construction materials for buildings which were soon to be placed on the market.

Plans and specifications for the entire roadway were not completed until early in December and advertisements posted in the bureau and the field engineer's office at Dawson Springs; notices were also sent to numerous bidders of bids to be opened on December 20, 1919. In response to this advertisement three proposals were received—one from the Dawson Springs Construction Co., Dawson Springs, Ky.; one from Frank G. Breslin, Louisville, Ky.; and one from Speed-Parker, Louisville, Ky. Of these bids the lowest was that of Frank G. Breslin, but all bids were rejected for the reason that the low bid had underlined marks indicating that certain of the materials were for delivery f. o. b. Dawson Springs instead of being wrought in place as indicated by the specifications, and the further fact that attached thereto was a letter stating that he would do this work within 90 days from April 1, 1920, which was not in line with the specification requirements and the acceptance of which would have so delayed construction work as to make the bid unacceptable at any price.

These bids were rejected and the bidders requested to resubmit their bids on an addendum specification which would definitely quote for all work in place and completion within 90 days from the date of acceptance of the bid, and in response to this request for resubmission only one bid was received—that of the Dawson Springs Construction Co. This bid has not been accepted.

The records show that the Dawson Springs Construction Co. was the lowest of three bids received for three buildings first advertised by \$1,568, and on specifications revised to cheapen the cost of construction their proposal was some \$30,000 lower than any of the other bids received; notwithstanding this, their bid is still held in abeyance unaccepted.

In regard to the statement that there was collusion between the Public Health Service and the contractor it should be stated unequivocally that preference was not given to the donor of the land nor any of his agents, nor has the field engineer in any communication ever addressed to the bureau, so far as the records show, stated or intimated that the contractor was being favored to the detriment of the public interest; neither has he stated so verbally to the constructing engineer; nor, so far as he, the constructing engineer, knows, to any member of the force under his direction. Furthermore, the records show numerous instances where the field engineer recommended the acceptance of the proposals by the Brandenburg Construction Co., which the bureau deemed unreasonably high and rejected, with direction for the field engineer to secure better prices than those he recommended for acceptance.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

RUPERT BLUM,  
Surgeon General.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Perhaps the gentleman will insert the figures given on page 823 of the hearings.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I do not know what the gentleman has reference to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Where it appears bids for the same kind had been let for Kentucky road construction.

Mr. KINCHELOE. This estimate does show that road work has been done for lower prices in Kentucky, but it is not parallel with this work at all, because this is a rough country over which this road is being built, very inaccessible and hard to get to, and being such a small contract no reputable construction company would take this work as cheaply as they would on a public road where the work is easier to get to and larger contracts. I will say, further, that the Illinois Central Railroad Co. built a cut-off through the city of Dawson Springs, and I am reliably informed that the contract cost it practically a million dollars in excess of its expectations when the work began.

Gentlemen, it was a great and a patriotic effort on the part of the good people in and around the city of Dawson Springs to raise enough money to pay for this 5,000 acres of land. I attended a public meeting there last spring, and at this meeting I saw colored porters and waiters at the hotels giving from \$15 to \$25 each to pay for this land. When representatives of the Dawson Springs Commercial Club went to Mr. Simmons, of the Simmons Hardware Co., and offered to buy the coal lands which I have hereinbefore mentioned, Mr. Simmons told them, in substance, that his company was receiving a 6 per cent dividend in the way of royalties on a \$300,000 investment in this land and that same was not for sale. When these representatives told



him the purpose for which it was to be used, that it was for the United States Government, Mr. Simmons replied, "If it is for my country, if it is for the erection of a hospital for discharged disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines, I will not only let the Government have it, but you gentlemen can go and assess the value of it and I will take it."

These representatives assessed it at \$15 per acre, and the Simmons Hardware Co. not only accepted this amount but sent their abstractors there and made an abstract of the title and turned it over to the Government for this price from the people. Yet, in view of these facts, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] comes and criticizes the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Public Health Service and charges upon the statements of this man Graff that money is being wasted there. Has his patriotic constituency in Chicago ever offered anything free to the Government, and especially in this large proportion? It is a very late day for the gentleman to come now and be solicitous about the care and comfort of these poor, disabled, discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and it comes in bad grace for the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] to come at this late day and undertake to criticize the Treasury and Bureau of Public Health Service in the face of the fact that had it not been for the consolidated opposition of the Republican side of the House when this legislation was pending the hospital at Dawsonsprings would have long since been completed and full of these discharged, disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines receiving the care and attention they should.

The gentleman from Illinois would have you believe that Mr. Troendle, one of the public-spirited men of Dawsonsprings, is undertaking to "hold up" the Government in these contracts. Mr. Troendle is only one of the many patriotic people there who have devoted their time and money to pay for this land, and the Dawsonsprings Construction Co., of which he is President, has come in the open and made competitive bids on all these contracts and has been the lowest bidder every time and is entitled to these contracts because of this fact.

It comes in bad faith for the gentleman from Illinois, who knows nothing about this transaction, to come on the floor of Congress and undertake to criticize Mr. Troendle and the rest of these patriotic citizens of Dawsonsprings, Ky.

There is no more suitable place in the United States than at Dawsonsprings for the erection of a sanatorium. It has a splendid climate and, in my judgment, the finest mineral water in the world. It is my sincere hope that the building operations may proceed as rapidly as possible, in order that this splendid sanatorium may be completed so that these disabled, discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines may have the advantage of this institution. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the railroad question, dealing particularly with the "Bryan plan" for solving the railroad problem. The "Plumb plan" has had its day in court, but the "Bryan plan" has been sorely neglected. It has escaped the notice of the country generally that on August 29, 1919, William Jennings Bryan, appearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, announced his platform. His recent expressed wish to have the League of Nations issue out of the way and his still more recent reprimand directed toward the titular head of the national Democratic committee for attempting to resurrect John Barieycorn from his newly made grave was to be expected in view of the Nebraskan's propensity for a paramount issue.

Now, when the man speaks who said "Coo" to one Democratic national convention and thereby defeated all other aspirants and nominated himself for the presidency and who said "Boo" to another Democratic national convention and thereby defeated one of the greatest Democratic statesmen of the last quarter of a century and nominated a man who almost fastened international socialism upon his country, it is high time the country knew about his paramount issue.

To those who believe that young men dream dreams and old men see visions I respectfully recommend a careful reading of Bryan's remarkably visionary testimony before our committee. But first, to prove that the presentation was meant to be in the nature of a platform, I read from his testimony at the hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Said Mr. Bryan:

My plan is only presented for consideration that it may be kept in mind when the people decide these questions. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1695.)

When we consider this frank statement that his real forum was to be the political campaign the essentials of his plan become an interesting study, for they are so formed as to make a bid for votes in every direction and are as refreshingly impracticable and

charmingly visionary as any of his previous paramount issues. But let us see the plan in his own words:

I beg to propose as alternative what may be described as a dual plan, which contemplates the ownership and operation of a Federal trunk-line system, sufficient to reach into every State and make each State independent by giving it an outlet for all it has to sell and an inlet for all it has to purchase, and the ownership and operation of all the other lines by the States in which the lines are situated. \* \* \* (Hearings, p. 1684, vol. 2.)

\* \* \* Now, the dual plan adapts itself not only to our form of government but to our conditions in this country. A trunk line, only sufficient to reach into every State and furnish each State an outlet, and thus make it independent, instead of costing eighteen or twenty billions of dollars, would not cost, I should say, over four or five billions. The plan does not contemplate the nationalization of every railroad that runs through two or more States. It contemplates a bare, skeleton Government trunk line that will give to every State a position of independence, and thus enable it to treat without coercion or compulsion with the States adjoining. Because a railroad runs through a number of States is no reason why it should be regarded as a trunk line and owned by the Federal Government. The fact that it runs through several States would not interfere at all with operation by each State on the part of the line that is within the State. \* \* \* (Hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1688-1689.)

\* \* \* This plan not only lessens the amount that will be necessary to inaugurate, so far as the national part is concerned, but it has another advantage, namely, that it distributes the question over time as well as over space. It divides a great problem now confronting the people into 49 problems—1 for Federal Government and 1 for each of the 48 States—and it permits the settlement of the question as the people of each State are ready to settle it. If a State does not desire to take over and operate the lines within its borders immediately, it can, if it wishes, leave them in private hands until the sentiment of the people of the State is ready for Government ownership. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1689.)

[Laughter.]

He candidly admits that it is experimental and that it may take years to get it to working. Witness this:

If a State does not desire to immediately enter upon the State ownership and operation of the railroads within its borders, it can leave these railroads in private hands until the sentiment of the State is ready.

Not only that, but the plan gives us an opportunity to test out the system. A great many people might hesitate to try a new policy on so large a scale; they would say, "If it does not succeed, we will have spent an enormous amount of money, and we will find it difficult to return to the old system," but if you distribute this question over a number of years the States that wait will have the benefit of the experience of the States that try, and if the theory upon which the change is made proves to be unsound in practice it can be stopped, and a return can be made with less loss and with less derangement of business. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1690.)

[Laughter.]

This quoted testimony also shows that he intends to take the railroad companies by the nape of the neck and make them take back the roads in case State ownership does not prove a success. Besides, he coddled himself into the sublimest calm by pondering in his dreams over the happy thought that the States that wait could watch the floundering of the States that just jumped right in and possibly keep out of the whirlpool. Let me repeat his language:

If you distribute this question over a number of years, the States that wait will have the benefit of the experience of the States that try, and if the theory upon which the change is made proves to be unsound in practice it can be stopped and a return can be made with less loss and with less derangement of business. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1690.)

[Laughter.]

Experiments seem to be his particular delight, and the multiplicity of experiments possible under his plan seems to have about the same effect upon him as the needle did on the famous character of Sherlock Holmes. I read further from his testimony:

A trunk line only sufficient to reach into every State \* \* \* would not cost, I should say, over four or five billion dollars. (Hearings, p. 1188.) But, gentlemen of the committee, the plan that I suggest to you has this advantage, namely, that if there is any doubt in the minds of those who are willing to try Government ownership, it gives a chance to try it without investing as much as would be necessary to buy all the railroads. Further, I beg to suggest that if you have 48 States, each one with its system of transportation owned and operated by the State government, you have 48 experimental stations. (Hearings, pp. 1690-1691.)

He admits on examination that what we really need is a practical solution. But the mere fact that we would first have to pass the bill by the House and Senate, then amend a few State constitutions, educate the people in favor of it, get 48 State legislatures to act favorably thereon, and have endless and hopeless confusion during the interim does not disturb the sweetness of his dreams. [Laughter.]

Listen to the following:

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Of course, with the railroad problem before us now, what we want is a practical solution.

Mr. BRYAN. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Your proposed solution would require, first, the adoption of it by Congress. We could, of course, issue no edict to the States. It would require the adoption by each of the States of the same plan?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. A great many of the States would have to change their constitutions. Some of the States might not adopt the plan at all. This is quite conceivable, is it not?

Mr. BRYAN. No; it is not conceivable, if you will pardon me. That is, when a plan is tried it is either demonstrated to be a success or a failure. If it is demonstrated to be a success, it is only fair to assume it will be adopted.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Of course, the plan will not be in its entirety until it is adopted by all the States. So the plan, as a plan, can not be tested until it is adopted by all the States, and hence its success or failure could not influence any of the States to come in.

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, I beg your pardon. The failure of one State to adopt it will not interfere with the other States adopting it at all.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Well, suppose Illinois does adopt the plan and suppose Indiana and Wisconsin do not. Now, would Illinois have the right to condemn the Pennsylvania Railroad at the State line, coming across there, and take it over?

Mr. BRYAN. No; not the interstate line.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Well, you already have the national—

Mr. BRYAN (interposing). I thought you meant the Government line. It could condemn any part of any other line; it can to-day. If the Pennsylvania can condemn the individual's property, do you doubt the State that gave it that right can go out and condemn the railroad?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. It is your opinion that the State of Illinois could condemn a part of an interstate railroad and control it? Well, that would dismember the road for interstate purposes.

Mr. BRYAN. Not at all.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. How would it operate?

Mr. BRYAN. The board that had control of the roads in Illinois would act in conjunction with the board that had control in Indiana, if it was a Government road, or, if a privately owned road, with the manager, and they would arrange for their joint operations. You would have to assume that a road would not look out for its own interests in order to take any other position.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Would you prevent any railroad company from engaging in interstate commerce?

Mr. BRYAN. No; and I think you can safely leave that matter to the United States. The Federal Government will really set the price and terms of interstate commerce.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. What would be your estimate of the number of years that it would take to put that plan into effect?

Mr. BRYAN. I would not attempt to guess, because it would be merely a guess, and my experience has led me to be a little cautious about fixing a time. It is easier to tell the direction of the wind than to measure its velocity; it is easier to tell the trend of events than it is to tell how soon a thing will be accomplished.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Would you release any of the Federal control after that plan had been adopted, or would you continue Federal control until it had been completely adopted?

Mr. BRYAN. I think that would have to be determined by the conditions as they arose. There is this general proposition that I have always gone on, namely, that the people will have as much sense to-morrow as they have to-day, and probably more light. Therefore you can safely leave until to-morrow the decision of questions that can not be decided to-day.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. But in formulating a plan we have to decide on something, and I was wondering whether in your plan it was your purpose to continue Federal control until all the States had adopted your plan, or whether it was your purpose that when Illinois, say, had adopted the plan Federal control would be withdrawn.

Mr. BRYAN. If the Federal Government's trunk line reached out into every State its control over interstate commerce would, I think, be more effective than under any commission or board.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Then, would you release Federal control?

Mr. BRYAN. It might be possible to release it; but I do not think it is necessary to decide that question until we reach it. (Hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1706-1707.)

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I was, curious to know why the gentleman was jumping on Bryan. I notice that Bryan and Sims have no friends on the Democratic side, and I was wondering why they were attacked on the Republican side.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I understood that Bryan and Plumb were going to join hands, and I wanted the country to know the Bryan plan so the people would know the result of the combination.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does Mr. Bryan suggest a method of financing this scheme?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. That does not bother him in the least.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is negligible, is it not?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The furnishing of this \$5,000,000,000 is a negligible proposition?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Yes. That is a feature the people can decide.

On second thought he brings in the traction lines. I quote:

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. How about the State owning the traction lines?

Mr. BRYAN. My preference would be to have the States own the interurban lines that were not in the city, and I see no objection to putting this whole thing together, because, you see, if the State owned the railroad lines it would simply be adding the intercity traction lines to them. They would hardly be embraced in the Federal trunk-line system. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1708.)

Notice that he gives national control of some trunk lines. That, he thinks, will catch those favoring nationalization. He proposes State control of many lines to please those who favor States rights. He permits private control if they do not like the experiment, thus appealing to those believing in private control. He uses great care not to offend the Plumb Plan League, and gives the following clear-cut statement on that plan:

Mr. DENISON. You may have expressed your views before I came into the room in reference to the question that I am going to ask, and if you did you need not repeat them. I wanted to ask you whether or not you think that the so-called Sims plan, or the Plumb plan, as embodied in the Sims bill, would be a good thing for this country?

Mr. BRYAN. I have not felt that one could safely answer that question "yes" or "no," because if one makes an answer "yes" or "no" to that the statement is apt to go out without qualification, and he is put in a position that is not his true position. I would not want to answer whether the plan is good or bad, because it might seem like an indorsement of it or a condemnation of it. I have pointed out two or three things that I thought were good, and I have pointed out some things that I thought were bad, simply in conjunction with the discussion. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1704.)

I hope no Member here but entertains a high personal opinion of the great commoner, and to be sure that I shall leave you all feeling kindly toward him I will read you the following tribute he paid you:

But while we could reduce the rates in the State we could not do it in Congress as well as we could in the State. I do not think we ever can, on the theory that the farther a Congressman gets away from home the more difficult it is to watch him, and therefore the more difficult it is to make him serve the public. (Hearings, vol. 2, p. 1697.)

[Laughter.]

With the greatest domestic problem of a century before this great legislative body, upon the proper solution of which depends the happiness of all our people, we ought all to have a prayer of thanks upon our lips that the country has been spared the disaster of the "Bryan plan." [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on the 21st of January I introduced House joint resolution 279, for the speedy return of the bodies of American military dead buried in France to the United States, which reads as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the bodies of American soldiers, sailors, and marines buried in France should be speedily removed and returned to the United States in all cases where requests for such return are made by the nearest of kin of such soldiers, sailors, and marines, for burial in the United States; and that all appropriate and necessary steps be taken to induce the French Republic to repeal, modify, or suspend, in so far as the same may apply to the bodies of all American soldiers, sailors, and marines, all laws and regulations of the French Republic preventing the immediate disinterment and speedy removal to the United States of the bodies of such soldiers, sailors, and marines.*

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of State transmit to the Government of the French Republic a certified copy of this resolution.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed, upon the French Republic consenting to such disinterment and removal, to take appropriate and necessary action to exhume and remove to the United States, at the earliest possible date and with all reasonable speed, the bodies of all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American Expeditionary Forces who are buried in France and the return of whose bodies to the United States is desired and expressed by the nearest of kin. The Secretary of War is further directed, upon arrival of such bodies in the United States, to make such delivery or disposition of such bodies as may be or may have been heretofore requested, respectively, by the nearest of kin.

I am not forgetful of what has been done through the State Department in this matter and I desire to give full credit to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House and to the Secretaries of the State and War Departments for all affirmative action in this behalf. Besides personal visits on earlier dates, on November 13, 1919, I addressed letters to the Secretaries of War and State, asking to be advised of the then present status of the question regarding the return of the soldier dead buried in France. I have been told that the bringing back of the bodies of the soldiers must of necessity wait the transportation back of the Army in France. On November 19 a letter from the War Department came in response to my letter, reading in part as follows:

The Secretary of War has received your letter of November 13 and directs me to say that the State Department is making the most urgent representations to the French Government with regard to the wishes of the American people concerning the return of our military dead to this country. We trust that these negotiations will soon terminate successfully.

On November 28 the Secretary of State addressed to me a letter, with inclosures, which letter reads in part as follows:

The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 13 asking that you be advised of the present status of the question regarding the return of the soldier dead buried in France.

In reply, it gives me pleasure to inclose a paraphrase copy of the recent instructions sent at the request of the War Department to the American Embassy in Paris and also of the embassy's replies. These indicate definitely the present status of the question.

The copy of the instructions sent and the replies received I do not feel authorized to insert herein, not having been given out for publication, but doubtless the same was furnished to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I will say, however, that the representations to the French Government made by the Secretary of State were strong and urgent and well expressed the wishes and views of the relatives seeking to have returned our military dead to this country.



On November 24 the following was published by the Associated Press:

PARIS, November 24.

The 65,000 American dead in France must be left in the graves they now occupy until the French are ready to exhume their own dead, which, it is hoped, will be before January 1, 1922.

The foreign office has promised to consider the latest request of the American Government for the return of the fallen soldiers, but later the following announcement was made:

"It has been definitely decided that allies who fell together for the same cause should remain together in death until circumstances permit of the returning of the bodies to the families for whom they sacrificed themselves."

The proposed law forbidding the exhumation of the soldier dead for three years did not pass at the last session of the Chamber of Deputies, but the foreign office expects it will be adopted soon. This bill specifies a delay in exhumation for three years from the promulgation of the law, but it expected that this period will be shortened.

At the foreign office it is said that the exhumation will commence considerably before January, 1922.

WASHINGTON, November 24.

Instructions that American soldier dead interred in France outside of the so-called "zone of armies" be brought home as soon as arrangements are completed have been issued by Secretary Baker. About 18,000 bodies lie outside of the zone. Return of those within it depends on action by the French Government, which has been asked to withdraw its restrictions.

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Pierce has been placed in charge of the graves registration service.

On January 3 the press carried a cablegram from France, dated Paris, January 3, reading as follows:

The French Government has granted permission for the removal of the bodies of 20,000 American soldiers buried in France to the United States. The bodies to be removed are those buried in cemeteries outside the zone of the armies and do not include those gathered into big American cemeteries in the army zones.

The above publications appeared in the press of this country and attracted instant and wide attention.

The ban has been lifted as to those not within the military zone or outside of the so-called "zone of the armies."

I hope it is not too early to speak now and to ask Congress to speak in behalf of lifting the ban as to all American soldiers buried in France, and thus supplement the representations to the French Government, made by the Secretary of State, asking that the restrictions now in force may be rescinded or modified in order to enable the War Department to undertake the removal of all the bodies of the soldier dead in as well as outside of the so-called zone of the armies, where desired by next of kin, as speedily as possible.

I speak now so that Congress may evidence some interest in behalf of the thousands of relatives who are interested in the early return of the bodies of those who fell within the battle lines.

If they can bring back those that died from sickness and disease to this country, without disturbing the morale of the French Government, with equal propriety they can bring back those who in the prime of health fell and died on the battle field and are now buried in the so-called zone of the armies.

It has been more than a year since the armistice was signed. To wait three years and more from that date is too long.

I am aware of the propaganda that is going on in this country to influence the public mind and to impress upon the relatives the idea that the remains of their soldier dead should be permitted to stay in the so-called American cemeteries; and largely because of that propaganda I have seen fit to speak to-day. If Congress evidences no interest in it, if Congress does not speak, if there is no response from this body, representing as it does the people of the country, to the various resolutions that have been offered and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if there is no activity or desire for action expressed by the legislative body in aid of the expressed wish of the Secretary of State, the French Government may conclude that the American dead shall not be removed from within the military zone until they have removed their own dead or may refuse to rescind or modify its order. I do not believe the French Government should be left in any doubt as to how the American people feel with reference to this matter. There ought not to be a delay of three years, nor any further delay, and I speak because I think that there ought to be some speed, some hastening of the day when these bodies can be returned. It can not be said that we have not now the ships. The promise is well remembered that the War Department said, "You must wait until the soldiers are returned," which was reasonable, and then it was expected that the remains of the soldier dead would be returned.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no necessity for an appeal to Congress for action in behalf of the early return to this country of all our soldier dead buried on foreign soil, nor should it be necessary to appeal to the executive branch of the Government or any department thereof for speedy action in this behalf, nor should it be necessary to appeal to any foreign government to remove restrictions that forbid or hinder the removal and early return to the United States of the bodies of those who gave

their lives that France might live, nor should the relatives of these soldier boys be required to longer plead that the promise made by this Government, through its Secretary of War, be kept without further delay.

With some hesitation I speak, but I am reluctant to longer delay my appeal here, as I have made it elsewhere, when so many relatives have appealed to me to help hasten the return of the bodies of their soldier boys. I had hoped that it would not be necessary for resolutions to be introduced in Congress in this behalf, but there has been active and pronounced opposition to their return. Some in high military authority have not approved of the return of the soldier dead and have sought to hush the appeal for the return of their bodies to their relatives, and have urged that their remains be kept where buried on foreign soil; but the appeal grows stronger and the demand is that the faith of this Government be kept and the pledged word be not broken. I hope and believe that no foreign order will prevent its being kept, and I trust there is no real, substantial obstacle in the way. The French Government will not refuse to do what this Government asks and urges to be done; to refuse would be an unfriendly or hostile act. Let it not be further suggested that the morale of the French people might be disturbed. Two million American soldiers crossed the seas to save the life and soil of France.

Billions of dollars were given that France might not be wholly destroyed. They will not deny the relatives of those soldier boys who could not return the privilege of having the bodies of their loved ones brought back to rest in their own cemeteries, where they can visit and place flowers with their own hands upon the graves of their loved ones. They can not go to France, not one in a thousand, and their remains should not be held longer for any alleged reasons in graves on foreign soil against the expressed wishes of their relatives, who have been given the solemn promise for their early return. Let no further excuses be made. Let no barriers be raised abroad by consent or delay of our representatives or agents in any department of the Government.

Much time has already run; more speed should be evidenced. The ships that carried the soldiers across and back can bring the bodies back. The same Treasury that poured out its golden stream that saved France can give the small pittance necessary to bring back their remains. Let no profiteer who has fattened while our country bled and our mothers wept offer any suggestion about the expense of this promise being kept. Those of large means can go across and see the cemeteries where our soldiers lie, but the mothers, wives, and sisters who can not go ask the simple privilege of caring for their soldier boys, whose graves they can not visit on foreign soil.

Measure not the dollars to be given now against the dollars that you would annually appropriate to care for their graves on foreign soil for many years to come until forgotten. Let the morale of this country and of those who have lost be cared for, and let the grateful hearts of those who appeal to you be the object of your first concern.

These bodies should not be longer held for any ulterior purpose. Let no propaganda of those whose hearts have been untouched by sorrow nor sordid commercialism obscure the judgment of those whose duty it is to think first of the morale of those entitled to be heard. Shake not their confidence in the representatives and officials of their own Government. Let not the broken word of a great Republic be the gift to the appealing relative who asks for a promise kept and for the remains of him who in the flower of youth gave his all that the honor of this Republic might live. Gratitude should be evidenced by early action and not the neglect by further delay. I hope the efforts of the executive department will avail to remove all barriers at an early date, and let Congress supplement that effort.

You can not abandon to foreign care the bodies of your soldier dead and be forgiven. No country can afford to forget its dead. No nation can live without gratitude in its heart. Commercialism will not perpetuate its life. Cold philosophy from those in high places will not satisfy the yearnings nor answer the prayers of those who ask for promises to be kept. No cold philosophy will satisfy the hearts of the bereaved nor warm the love for country.

The lives given at your call to save the freedom of the seas, to protect your commerce, should be more highly regarded than sunken cargoes, measured by dollars, the lives given that liberty and love and gratitude might endure. Do not forget the heart-strings while you guard the purse strings. The life of a nation is not in its gold, but it is in the heartbeat of a grateful and loving people, willing to do and die, where right and justice is placed above sordid gold. While a world revolution is going on you can not perpetuate its civilization upon dollars or on commerce or on force, but it must rest upon the more sacred things, which you must preserve or your civilization will die.

Let relatives be allowed the privilege of erecting monuments of love over the graves of loved ones, upon which the tender hands of mothers, wives, and sisters can place flowers of affection and moisten with tears of sorrow. They ask not for the Government care, but only their return, so they can care for them with their own hands.

I have seen and heard from these stricken men, mothers, wives, and sisters and have told them of the promised word. Their letters have come and are still coming. The inquiry is, When? The answer rests with the agents and representatives of this Government. Those in high authority can hasten the day, and Congress can aid if it will. France will not stand in the way; if it does, I ask the question, Is there still the lingering fear of German aggression resting in the Frenchmen's hearts that desires assurance in case of another war that they will more readily have American support by keeping the bodies of American dead buried on French soil, as hostages from the United States to inspire or compel her to protect the soil of France, where our soldiers lie? Let not this country surrender its right for their return for any such military reason, for the fear that the friendship of our country will wane if the dead are returned. We want them on no foreign soil but to rest on American soil near the homes that reared them.

Does France fear that this country may not always manifest its friendship and that it needs the cemeteries of our dead on her soil to protect France in future years?

If we love our dead and hold them in tender memory, we will bring them back and let them be cared for by loving hands that gave them in trust for our country's sake, to be returned when the work was done on the battle line. Let France refuse and then that friendship may wane.

We can not forget with safety those who defended the flag on foreign soil to vindicate the honor and integrity of our Government. You owe a duty to the living soldiers, maimed and unmaimed, whom you sent 3,000 miles across the seas to mingle in the hell of battle, and you dare not forget the relatives of those who gave their life's blood that this country might endure. Most of those that fell and died were mere youths, who had answered their country's call, who loved their native land and believed in the gratitude of their country, and that they would be returned to be buried among their kin, and not left forgotten for all time on foreign soil.

It has been suggested that they can not be brought back for three years. That is too long. If you sent across 2,000,000 in a few months, you can return a few thousand in a short time. The press states that the last of the A. E. F. soldiers have returned. It was promised that the bodies would be brought back shortly after the soldiers were returned.

Will you make it impossible to enter any cemetery in this United States and to point to a monument erected over the grave of a single soldier who died in battle in France? The propaganda against bringing the bodies back will doubtless be used to influence the action of the French Government. Let Congress speak, so France may know that the legislative and executive departments ask alike for early action. Speak now before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri yields back two minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting the figures from the hearings concerning the number of dead, the number in the hospitals, and the amount of money expended, and also the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury as to the Shank contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 12046, the urgent deficiency bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 11806. An act to authorize the county of Fountain, in the State of Indiana, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Attica, Fountain County, Ind.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TOWNER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, until further notice, on account of public business.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if it would not be a wise idea, inasmuch as we have only 14 men here, to quit business for the afternoon?

Mr. GOOD. I propose to. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 28, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of proposed legislation permitting the acquisition of a site for distant-control radio station in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report on the investigation of the claim of Charles S. Hood for payment for services in connection with the removal of the Modoc Indians to Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XII,

Mr. DALE, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, to which was referred the bill (S. 3202) granting leave of absence to officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 588), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9996) granting an increase of pension to Emil A. Akerman; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11765) granting a pension to Mary T. Tupper; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11872) granting a pension to William Francis Sheridan; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12030) granting a pension to James C. Overbee; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 12099) to establish additional fish-cultural subsidiary stations in the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAINEY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 12100) to amend section 70 of "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved February 28, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12101) providing for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the eastern district of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12102) to provide and adjust penalties for violation of various navigation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 12103) to aid in winding up the affairs of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MOONEY: A bill (H. R. 12104) granting privilege of the floor and right to participate in debate to heads of executive departments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. GARLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 450) directing the Committee on War Expenditures of the House of Representatives to make full investigation of all purchases of hardware and other articles and sales of the same made by the Government during the war and up to the present time; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12105) granting a pension to Carl L. Setchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODALL: A bill (H. R. 12106) granting an increase of pension to Susanna A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 12107) granting a pension to Robert H. Foote; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 12108) granting a pension to Lucile D. Murphey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12109) for the relief of Leslie E. Drake; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12110) granting an increase of pension to Elexious H. Conley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12111) granting an increase of pension to Frank P. Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 12112) granting a pension to Francis P. Crane; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12113) granting a pension to Julia Gallagher; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12114) granting a pension to Rose M. Cheronnier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 12115) granting a pension to Agnes E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 12116) granting a pension to J. H. Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 12117) granting a pension to Elizabeth Purviance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12118) granting a pension to Bert Rich; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 12119) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 12120) granting a pension to Mary Plum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 12121) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Wisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12122) granting an increase of pension to Eva Whittlebery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1141. By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of citizens of Haddonfield, Camden County, N. J., favoring House bill 262; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1142. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against the passage of House bill 4871; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1143. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of St. Charles (Ill.) Post No. 342, American Legion, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1144. By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Thomas Post, No. 84, Grand Army of the Republic, of Lancaster, Pa., urging Congress to pass an act to exile anarchists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1145. Also, petition of Paul Revere Leber Post, No. 372, American Legion, of Columbia, Pa., urging drastic legislation against such organizations that are responsible for the Centralia outrage, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1146. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolutions of the board of directors of the American State Bank, Oakwood, Mich., protesting against discontinuance of the work of widening and deepening the River Rouge; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1147. Also, resolutions of the Michigan League of Home Dailies, favoring retention of the present zone postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1148. By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of president of the Maryland State College, urging legislation to strengthen the

farm-loan bank system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1149. Also, petition of the North Carolina Pine Box and Shook Manufacturers' Association, of Baltimore, urging an increase in the appropriation for the forest products laboratory of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1150. Also, petition of Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, of Baltimore, Md., voicing its approval of the antistrike clause in the railroad legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1151. Also, petitions of W. E. Beveridge and J. C. Knowles, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the enactment of the peacetime sedition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1152. Also, petition of 11 citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging retention of railroads under Government control for a period of two years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1153. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of the American Federation of Railroad Workers, of Lackawanna, N. Y., opposing the Esch-Cummins railroad bills now pending; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1154. Also, petition of the Sixty-fifth Regiment Veterans' Association, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1155. Also, petition of the Board of Trade of Akron, N. Y., indorsing House bill 10650; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1156. By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Caryville, Tenn., relative to the high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1157. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of William M. Haradon, of New York City, opposing the reduction of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1158. Also, petition of citizens of New York City, relative to certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1159. Also, petition of the joint legislative board of the State of New York, of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, the Order of Railway Conductors, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, relative to certain railroad legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1160. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Neisel, a gold-star mother, against the return of the dead from the battle fields of France; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1161. Also, petition of John J. O'Keefe, of New York City, opposing the League of Nations covenant and favoring submitting it to the vote of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 28, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost call us to Thy service. Thou hast not separated Thyself from us. Thou hast sent messages to us from the skies and they have been recorded in the high and ennobling impulses that arise out of our hearts and in our striving after the best and highest and truest. We pray Thee to guide us by Thine own counsel in the affairs of life that we may do Thy will and accomplish Thy purpose. For Christ's sake. Amen.

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by Prof. Philip Marshall Brown, professor of international law at Princeton University, in relation to the treaty and the Senate. It is taken from the New York Sun of yesterday.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATTEMPT TO COERCE THE UNITED STATES SENATE—A PROTEST FROM THE PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL LAW AT PRINCETON.

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: I desire to register a vigorous protest against the organized moral coercion now being exerted on the Senate at a time when it should be most respected in the exercise of one of its most important functions, namely, the treaty-making power. The pressure which has been artificially stimulated and brought